Vol. LV. No. 3 September, 1916

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

TOWARDS SOCIAL ART. THE GREGORIAN PLAIN-CHANT 225
L. VAN ISEGHEM, Folkestone, England.
CANONICAL FORMATION OF PARISHES AND MISSIONS 238
E RUCUPIS.
THE PASSIONISTS IN IRELAND 250
R. F. O'CONNOR, Dublin, Ireland.
CRUCIFIXES OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS 259
The Rev. FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M., Paterson, New Jersey.
FATHER MATHEW, APOSTLE OF TEMPERANCE 265
VIATOR.
THE DANGER OF GIVING OUT FICTION FOR RELIGIOUS TRUTH 280
The Rev. JOHN E. GRAHAM, Baltimore, Maryland.
THE PRIMARY EFFECT OF EXTREME UNCTION 291
The Rev. F. TECKLENBURG, Mound City, Illinois.
THE PRIEST AND THE AUTOMOBILE 300
STANDARDIZATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES 302
THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS FOR THE VALIDITY OF ORDINATION 303
SUNDAY EXCURSIONS AND SUNDAY MASS 304
THE RIGHT OF CELEBRATING SOLEMN REQUIEM MASS IN A CHURCH 307
CONFESSION AND COMMUNION OF GREEK CATHOLICS 309
RECENT BIBLE STUDY: Christological Theories, XVI: The Christ of Union Theological Seminary 318
The Rev. WALTER DRUM, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1916: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press
Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $3.50; Foreign, 15 shillings ($3.65)
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne, Australia: W. P Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered, 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

St. Bernard's Seminary O-Neh-Da Vineyard
ALTAR WINE

ON account of the increased cost of labor and of materials used in shipping Altar Wines and of a recently imposed government tax we find it necessary to revise our prices as indicated below.

We take occasion to call attention to the reliability of the wine and to its superior qualities. The wine is made according to the rules of the Church **under the personal supervision of the Right Reverend Thomas F. Hickey, Bishop of Rochester, who gives his guarantee to the purity of the wine.** It is both licit and valid matter for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Revised List—Spring of 1916

GRADES AND PRICES

Ordinary Altar Wine, made from Concord, Catawba and Worden grapes,
Bottled, 5 gallons in 25 bottles ..... $ 8.00
In bulk, 1 keg 10 gallons. 12.50
In bulk, 1 keg 23½ gallons... ..... 27.00
In bulk, 1 barrel 46 gallons 50.00

Elvira Altar Wine, made exclusively from the Elvira grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 9.00

Superior Altar Wine, made exclusively from Delaware, Brighton or Salem grape, sold only in bottles,
5 gallons in 25 bottles 16.00

War Tax Additional. **No Dealer has this Wine for sale.**

Kindly advise method of transportation—Freight or express.

Address all communications to REV. M. J. NOLAN, Chancellor, 72 Frank Street, Rochester, N. Y.

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

L'Admirable $6.25 per dozen

Novitiate $5.00 per dozen

Malvoisie $4.00 per dozen

Villa Joseph $4.00 per dozen

War Tax Additional

(COPY) SACRED HEART NOVITIATE
Los Gatos, Cal., January 3rd, 1916.

THE BARNSTON TEA COMPANY, 6 Barclay Street, New York City.

Gentlemen: It is with pleasure that, looking over our books, we observe that during the year 1915, we have shipped you in sealed cars, the following quantities of our altar wines:

13,252	Gallons	Sweet Novitiate
6,012½	Gallons	Villa Joseph
3,843	Gallons	Malvoisie
103	Gallons	L'Admirable

We take the present opportunity to thank you for your conscientious and painstaking efforts made in handling our wines, the results of which are so gratifying.

For the coming year we have the greatest hopes; we have in our wineries an abundance of excellent wines, made by our own brothers and whose absolute purity we can therefore guarantee. Should your requirements for the coming year double or triple those of last year, we are confident that we can meet them.

Thanking you once more for your efforts made in selling our wines, and wishing you every success during the ensuing year, we desire to remain,

Yours very sincerely, THE SACRED HEART NOVITIATE,

John P. Mallon, S.J.
Treasurer

Sole Eastern Agents

Barnston Tea Company, 6 Barclay St., New York, N. Y.

Established 1870

FORTY-FIVE YEARS AS DEALERS IN VALID AND LICIT

Altar Wines

The Donnelly Brothers

respectfully call attention to their popular Altar Wines, popular because of their proven purity and agreeableness for use when fasting.

"Collegiate," "San Patricio,"
"Jurancon," "Vin de Tours,"
and "Pureza."

Satisfaction guaranteed. A trial order solicited.

THE DONNELLY BROTHERS

TROY, N. Y.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:

Ad R. P. Serphinum Cimino, Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Ministrum Generalem, Septimo exeunte Saeculo ex quo Indulgentia de Portiuncula Primum Divinitus data est 275

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS:

Decretum Omahensis et Kearneyensis mutationis Finium 276

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM:

I. Dubia de Kalendario 277

II. Dubia de Missa Votiva Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu et de Precibus post Missam 278

ROMAN CURIA:

List of Recent Pontifical Appointments 279

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 280

Danger of giving out Fiction for Religious Truth (*The Rev. John E. Graham, Baltimore, Maryland*) 280

The Primary Effect of Extreme Unction (*The Rev. F. Tecklenburg, Mound City, Illinois*) 291

The Priest and the Automobile 300

Standardization of Catholic Colleges 302

The Imposition of Hands for the Validity of Ordination 303

Sunday Excursions and Sunday Mass 304

The Key of Heaven 306

The Right of Celebrating Solemn Requiem Mass in a Church 307

Location of the Confessional 309

Confession and Communion of Greek Catholics 309

The Pre-Nuptial Promises: Two Cases 310

An Unusual Form of the Lord's Prayer 311

Renewing of the Sacred Species 312

Obligation of Attending Conference 313

The Obligation of Instructing Children 313

Mass "Sine Ministro" 314

Independent Odd Fellows 315

Rosary of the Way of the Cross 316

The Use of Easter Water 317

Is Australia Ahead of Us? 317

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study: Christological Theories XVI. The Christ of Union Theological Seminary (*The Rev. Walter Drum, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland.*) 318

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Pohle-Preuss: The Sacraments. Vol. II—The Holy Eucharist 328

Chrysostom: The Development of Personality 330

De Amicis: Consuetudines in Functionibus Liturgicis 335

Thurston: The Memory of our Dead 336

Harbin: Paradoxical Pain 337

Cunningham: A Study in the Philosophy of Bergson 339

Miller: Bergson and Religion 339

Gillette: Sociology 343

Towne: Social Problems 344

LITERARY CHAT 345

BOOKS RECEIVED 351

ENRICH YOUR LIBRARY

WITH A

SET OF THE REVIEW

OF RECENT MONTHS there has been quite a brisk turn-over of back copies of the REVIEW. We have been advertising for some numbers to help complete the files of some of our subscribers, and they are still in search of other back copies. If you need some back copies or volumes, or if you have them to dispose of, now is the time to write.

+ + + +

The increased activity in this department is doubtless due to the publication of the INDEX of the first fifty volumes of the REVIEW. The INDEX has proved itself a most useful volume, both for those who have all the volumes of the REVIEW and those who have only a few volumes. Subscribers who have not yet got a copy of the INDEX can procure one ($3.00 postpaid).

+ + + +

Priests who want early volumes of the magazine will do well to send in their requisition without delay. It is impossible to say from day to day what copies or volumes we shall have on hand to-morrow. At this writing we may have the numbers your set lacks or we may be able to get the missing copies for you. Let us know what you need or what numbers you wish to dispose of.

+ + + +

Start to build your set of REVIEW now. It has been a pleasure to us to help complete the sets of several of our subscribers, and we shall gladly try to do it for you. What more valuable for a priest's library than a set of the volumes of the REVIEW ?

TO-DAY, SEND FOR BACK COPIES, AND INDEX

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. V.—(LV).—SEPTEMBER, 1916.—No. 3.

TOWARDS SOCIAL ART. THE GREGORIAN PLAIN-CHANT.

DURING a recent visit to Quarr Abbey, where the Benedictines of Solesmes, expelled from France by the congregation law, carry on their monastic life, I was deeply impressed by the ideal of beauty which is so intimately connected with their religious worship. Though my early education in a Benedictine school had predisposed me to appreciate it, it was only during my quiet and peaceful sojourn at Quarr that I was able to penetrate its profound significance.

It has been said, "Ugly walls are bad advisers". To lift up the soul, to prompt it to deep thoughts and high aspirations, it must be placed in surroundings whose noble harmony will cause its whole being to vibrate in unison. In an atmosphere made in the likeness of the Heavenly Jerusalem, where nothing could shock and whence all discords would be banished, even the germ of evil would wither and die. Beauty, according to an old definition, is only the splendor of truth, which revealing itself openly, shows itself to us as the real good, and wins our adhesion. If we are in tune with the Universe, this accord is the Beautiful, and thus we are within the True, that is to say, in the Good, these three principles being only one which resolves itself ultimately into the being of God. It is this thought which, manifesting itself from the childhood of the nations, has inclined them often to attribute to arts, and to music in particular, an exclusively religious mission. The more men are accustomed to beauty and to eurythmy, the nearer will they approach to perfection, and evil will be to them but a faulty rhythm, causing a sensation

of pain. It might be interesting to speculate how far our modern world, pregnant of a new civilization, by its violent and dissonant contrasts and the inartistic necessities of industry and daily life, may be the cause of the deterioration of our nerves and our morals. Hence we have taken up again to-day the idea of the educational value of art, pointed out by Plato; so true is it that, for twenty centuries, we have only been rethinking the philosophy of the Greeks. And it is rather curious to note, in the pagan spirit of Jacques-Dalcroze or Isadora Duncan, as well as in the Christian soul of the monks of Solesmes, at both ends of the human mind and athwart different dreams, the same tendency toward the eternal ideal.

The Benedictine life flows on amidst surroundings whose calm, pure beauty, make it seem the vision of a Gothic painter, of an Angelico or a Dürer. From my writing table my eyes take in an Arcadian landscape. Broad meadows, carpeted with thick grass, stand out among the darker, harmoniously distributed, masses of the woods, offering noble prospects through the fields: one might be in a vast park. Everything is clothed in the universal green. There is not a spot that is not covered by this luxuriant vegetation, which makes of the Isle of Wight, as of the whole of England, a poem of greenery. Above the undulations of the land, in the bluish backgrounds, rises, faint and misty, the soft, curved outline of the hills, recalling, on a paler sky, the grace of the French landscapes. Birds sing in the tranquil garden and the perfume of the woods ascends through the open window. On the other side of the house, the trees slope down to the sea, which is bounded by white sunlit beaches and the blurred outline of Portsmouth. The monks have not lost the secret of erecting their abodes in the places where God reveals Himself by the marvels of His creation. The Abbey itself, though one may dislike the details, has, on the whole, a character with which our commonplace houses cannot compete. Life is hard there, the rooms bare, the furniture primitive, the dress simple, but nothing is vulgar; and the pomp of the ritual and its ceremonies, which paraphrase throughout the year the moving poem of the liturgy, the sublime greatness of the psalms repeated daily, with the admirable musical adaptation of Plain-

chant, make up the distinctive and artistic atmosphere that the monks breathe.

An existence permeated to such an extent by art would be irreconcilable with the ideal of monastic life, were its attraction merely picturesque, and were it not profoundly austere, pure, and serene. Thus, in Quarr all is beautiful but serious, nothing dissipates. The vaults and the walls are of bare and cold brick, and the eye, of which no gracious or charming fancy distracts the attention, meets only the great, severe lines of the early Ogival structure: one gets beauty and escapes sensuality. With a marvelous intuition, the whole disposition of the life has been made to converge toward its aim, contemplation; and Gothic art, with its flight toward the spiritual, spurning matter, is the expression most in harmony with the spirit of religion.

I have just indicated the qualities of Plain-chant, and the reason why the hearer, accustomed to the more skilful, conventional and sensuous music of the modern, feels at first somewhat confused.

Three chief points distinguish it from contemporary technique and define it. The diatonic style suited it because of its nobleness and firmness; it made it its own, leaving aside the chromatic and enharmonic styles whose looseness was inconsistent with the purity of its conception. You never find accidentals in the key, neither sharps nor flats, dissolvent and troubling elements which the profane art uses so freely in the translation of the emotions of the heart and the disorder of the feelings. The diatonic style is the most natural, being the only one that may be used without changing the tune; it remains the same all through. The Gregorian song appears to us as something perfectly beautiful, perfectly pure; one hears nothing that is not correct and clear, tranquil, calm and vigorous, impersonal and almost superhuman. Lofty, heavenly music, calming the charm and the allurements of the senses, and recalling, as opposed to our more dramatized and voluptuous art, the Olympic ideal, impassible and plastic, of the Hellenic sculpture.

The melody runs its course without shocks; it does not hurry, nor delay, and chiefly it proceeds by almost equal notes,

from which it derives perhaps its most exquisite sweetness. It must be noticed, indeed, that the primary tense does not divide, as in secular music; the note has for every tune a regular value, which, however, does not determine with a mathematical rigor the length of the sound. The supple and free rhythm will adapt itself to the nature of the words. And it is thanks to that uniformity, devoid of all stiffness, that the Roman cantilena owes, to a great extent, its calm, a little stern but never hard, its charm and its suavity. "It must not be inferred from this that all the notes are equal. In fact, if the primary tense does not divide, it may double or treble. Just as in a canvas embroidery, the same color of wool or silk may extend on more than one point, so on the canvas of the primary tenses, a same note may encompass two, three or four points in order to form the most agreeable melodic designs." [1]

The note which, in the recitative, always lasts one syllable will in this way keep on a vowel and continue its sound. Long phrases, slowly modulated, vocalized, will twist round a syllable. "The song is now bright like the light that falls from the white glass, then gloomy like the dark patch of the black capes in the stalls." There are upward soarings in the light, then falls, and the humiliated and wounded soul rises again and implores. It is the highest possible expression of love, adoring, beseeching, and thanking its God. "There are no *traits,* insipid *roulades*; these vocalizes remain expressive, because always they are slow. Each note that composes them, remaining distinct, keeps its own value and its own beauty." Certain anthems, with queerly flowered melodic lines, seem to have been traced by the same hand that carved a cathedral's capital.

Finally, the absence of polyphony achieves the absolute simplicity, the perfect unity, the sober and virile majesty of this art, which is only a melody whose slender thread intertwines with the words without ever much deviating from the normal tone, and under which one always feels, quite near, the recitative, of which this music is the first and most antique transformation. "No doubt, at first the recitation only was known,

[1] *L'art grégorien, son but, ses procédés, ses caractères,* lecture delivered at the Institut Catholique of Paris, in 1897, by Dom Mocquereau.

the *recto tono* psalmody, that is to say, on one single note. To this, little by little, other notes added themselves, either to announce the verse—and this became the intonation—or to end it—and this became the cadence." Thus the melody was born; and so we come, with Plain-chant, at the origins themselves of music.

At Vespers, the monks, facing one another in the stalls on both sides of the choir, sing the psalms, each side alternately and answering the other, verse for verse, on a regular and clear rhythm, which scans the sacred canticles and gives them a movement animated and grave at the same time, setting off the force and the male sublimity of their inspiration. I remember a Kyrie of archaic style and probably of Greek origin, and a Pater of strange and exceptional beauty. "There is no melody in it, not even a melopoeia; just an intonation, equally restricted, if not more, than that of the Preface; a cadence as periodical but more melancholic," a supplication so near to abandonment, which remains nevertheless dignified and steady, with a manly, energetic accent, a song as sublime as it has been given to man to form in his mortal life.

The organ itself, sustaining discreetly the singers in unison, is but a concession to the failings of the voice, sole reigning here. All sing in unison, and it is from these indefinitely numerous voices, which redouble and multiply it, that the strength of the Plain-chant chiefly comes. Mr. Camille Bellaigue, in a very fine article on the Gregorian chant at Solesmes,[2] from which I have already quoted, says: "I would not have thought it possible for so many voices to be one voice. Never did one of them outrun the others; never did one loiter after the others. Thus unic in duration, it was by its quality chiefly that this voice was unique: composed of all tones, no particular tone could be selected in it." I have heard, at the neighboring convent of St. Cecily, the psalmody of the nuns. Some voices are wonderfully pure and beautiful, but the effect is preferable by the men whose graver and less fragile voice-tone suits better with the severe and primitive grandeur of the Plain-chant. Perhaps the ideal would be to get both sexes singing together, as when a mixed congregation sings

[2] *Les Epoques de la Musique.* Vol. I, Paris, Delagrave.

in church, uniting thus sweetness and force, and summing-up the moral character of that music.

I have dwelt so far on its intrinsic beauty only; it is increased by its perfect adaptation to religion and the religious life, which it is designed to serve. If one considers that the monks perform the Office five times a day, and that therefore their whole life is permeated by it, one is able to realize the powerful magnetism that the virtue of this art exercises on them. Gothic is a supreme sedative. Imagine them absorbing every day the same quantity of modern music, shaken for many hours by the storming enthusiasms of Beethoven or the dissolving sadness of Chopin: conventual life would be impossible for them. On the contrary, bathed in the quiet and euphonic outpouring of the Gregorian monody, the mind, of which nothing disturbs the calm nor distracts the attention, enjoys that peace which the Benedictine Order has chosen as its motto, and can devote itself entirely to contemplation. Enforced by the collective contagion of unison which, uniting men in the same prayer, in the same words, so that they are finally but one voice and one heart, multiplies the individual forces, the ideal of robust healthiness and moral equilibrium for which this melody stands, will impress itself on the bodies as well as on the souls, harmoniously develop the whole man, lift up their hearts and cultivate in them the sense of beauty and of good. From that same principle which is commonly expressed by the French proverb: "La musique adoucit les mœurs", and is put into practice by the snake-charmers, depend the modern systems of education by dance or by rhythmic gymnastics. "Just as the profane songs," says St. Augustine, "provoke naturally the rhythmic movements of the body which are called dance, so the singing of hymns sets in motion the spiritual faculties of our soul and brings into being the harmonic play of virtues whose fruit is the amendment of morality and the final chord sanctity." [3] Thus we pass from the natural sphere into the spiritual, where sacred music is also a powerful means of perfection.

[3] Quoted by Dom Laurent Janssens in an address delivered at Namur, "Le Chant Sacré d'après St. Thomas", *Revue Bénédictine*, 1893, Vol. X, p. 213.

Exalted, refined, transformed already by art, the monks will feel inclined toward higher and more holy thoughts, their prayer will be easier and more fervent; the beauty of the chant will render the prayer more agreeable and penetrating, for song expresses the feelings with more force than simple speech. Then the quality of the music, appeasing the soul and leading it toward contemplation, soothing it and preparing it for the love of God, enables one to pray better. And finally, since everything is connected, to create beauty and love it, as the Benedictines well know, are only different ways of praying. "Let our praise be fine so that it may please the Almighty." Plain-song, by increasing the religious sense, introduces to God. And therefore we find that the Scripture as well as the Fathers frequently counsel the practice of holy hymnody, on the wings of which we are borne aloft into the presence of the Eternal. "There are certain Introits," says the learned Father whose conversations have made me think on that subject further than I ever had thought, "that of Easter, for instance, which not even the least musical monk could sing five times without being completely turned inside out, even from the spiritual point of view." So it is that the Benedictines have no other apostolate than that of the liturgy; they do not argue with people, they simply ask them to attend the office. And they are right when they think that the surest way of entering the soul and leading it to God, is to appeal not to the reason, which, while it can discuss faith, cannot create it, but rather to the heart from which emanate both the artistic and the religious emotions.

Gregorian song has only one object: public prayer. It has been said, Plain-chant is preëminently the music of religion; but not all religious music is Plain-chant; there are sacred masterpieces whose place is not in church. In the church, on the contrary, is the place of the Gregorian chant, and alone perhaps is it there thoroughly in the right place. It is because alone it is entirely adapted to the religious spirit; it is, so to speak, the voice of the cathedral, which is a symphony fashioned out of stones. The more recent music, even Palestrina's polyphony, is in the same relation to Plain-chant as the Basilica of St. Peter's is to the Ste. Chapelle, as a Ma-

donna of Raphael or a statue of Bernino are, in spite of the elegance and skill of their technique, to the works of Fra Filippo and Memling, more naive, more stiff, less pleasing to the senses because of the poverty and clumsiness of their means, but how much more profound, immaterial and ethereal in character, more glowing with spiritual life, passionate and burning with love, but of a love free from any taint of voluptuousness. The intellect of the Renaissance has its greatness, but, because it savors too strongly of profane graces and pagan sensuality, it has not the mystic sense. Gothic art alone, its painting and its music, the expression of the Catholic Middle Ages, are in perfect harmony with the mystic spirit of religion.

The Gregorian song, reëstablished by Dom Pothier and Dom Mocquereau, is the best musical form of prayer, like the liturgy, restored by Dom Gueranger, is its most excellent verbal form. The restoration of the melodies followed that of the texts; and the Benedictine order became thus the initiator of the movement which in these latter years has brought back the cult to the sound Roman traditions, and which was formulated in the reforms of the last Pontificate.

Because it is vocal before all things, because it is only chant, the Gregorian art is convenient for public prayer. It seems, in fact, as Mr. Bellaigue has noted, that the song of the human voice constitutes the music which is most free from fiction and artifice, the music in which the least matter mixes with speech to weigh it down, to restrain or to alter it.

Because it is verbal it suits the sacred words. The melody merely follows and embraces, so to speak, the literary phrase; it shapes really the discourse and sets it off; and at the same time no music is more respectful to the text, more supple and more sensible of its value. "Sometimes it presses, without ever disfiguring, sometimes, without stifling anything, it envelops; sometimes it slides and, as if in play, it passes on. One would not think that the words were *set to music,* but that the music had sprung out of the words themselves, in which it was potentially contained." The Latin accentuation is particularly convenient for this technique, based as it is wholly on the accent. And even the Latin pronunciation introduced by Dom Gueranger in the Benedictine office adds to its grace and harmony. Like the melody, the rhythm, far from hin-

dering or restraining it, moulds the text and corresponds to its diverse movements; free and easy rhythm, which gets as near as possible to nature, like that of prose, as opposed to the regular, artificial and conventional measures of poetry, to which the *isochrone* system of the modern musicians, with its fixed rhythms, might well be compared. Very regardful of the text, the melody can, if necessary, disengage itself from it, continue a syllable by vocalizes, in which the Gregorian *melisme* takes delicious opportunities. And we find, in this skilful combination of two elements, by which far from one being sacrificed to the other, the effect of both is on the contrary increased, a solution to the always agitated problem of the alliance of music and words.

No art could be more suitable for the expression of the feelings of the soul toward its Creator than music, which speaks to the heart rather than to the intelligence. But such music had to be simple, sober, strong and sweet at the same time, purged of terrestrial passions and keeping in the heart the calm, the serenity of divine contemplation. We have seen how the Gregorian technique fulfils these conditions, and none could fulfil them better. Its antiquity enhances its religious character. Contemporary with what it sings, this mode of expression was originated at the same time as the order of ideas and of feelings that it expresses; it may be born in the same countries as Christianity. Something of the East is to be found in the melodies gathered by St. Gregory among the Greek Canticles and those of Judæa, works of unknown masters, collections of popular creations, it may be, whose birth has so far remained mysterious. "An Hebraic origin, or at least an Hebraic influence is not improbable here. The ecclesiastical chants and those of the East are often similar in the intonation or the cadence, in the fancy and the caprice of the melisms and the vocalizes, principally in these modes, which seem so strange to us and regulate alike the psalmody of a monk and the cantilena that the Arab breathes on his reed flute." [4]

The monks to whom Plain-chant is so marvelously suited are thus also those who can interpret it best. Their simple,

[4] C. Bellaigue.

esthetic, chaste, and pious life, devoted to the contemplation of the eternal things, refines them, gives them an exceptional delicacy of feeling and renders them more apt to seize the gradations of these melodies, their signification, and as it were their preternatural soul; and the melodies, in return, continue to elate them. It is an incessant and progressive aspiration toward perfection. And indeed how they sing! It is their whole life that sings, and their song is their whole life being, their whole prayer. Never was art more living, because never was it more sincere, natural and true, more deeply human. "Mens nostra concordet voci nostrae"—let us put our hearts in unison with our voices, say the Benedictines. This music expresses without artificial means which stifle natural spontaneousness, what is at the bottom of their hearts; and that is why they understand it so well, why they really live it and why, when they sing, it is with their whole soul. Anticipating the future life, the sacred praises which constitute the object of their existence and their true work—*opus Dei,* the divine work—are for them the beginning of the never-ending canticle.

The chosen choir of the monks is the image of a universal choir. "Certain Kyrie, certain Sanctus," says again Mr. Bellaigue, "admirable at Solesmes, would be sublime under the vaults of Paris or Chartres, intonated by thousands of voices." There lies the essence of Plain-song, in its profound and fecund significance as a social art. The melody is sometimes individual and egoistic; it was so in Italy, in the years of reaction against Palestrina's polyphony, when the virtuosities of the *bel-canto* were all-powerful; but if well understood, it is, undoubtedly, more than polyphony, capable of expressing unity, and of creating it.

The Gregorian monody is intended to be executed in unison by all the assistants, a thing which the popular simplicity of its technique renders easy. The cantors, or a schola of chosen voices, may give the tone, sing the more difficult parts and support the general choir; but this latter always forms the basis and the essential element. Thus the people, by joining in the singing, will really participate in the office. During these few days spent at Quarr, never did the prayers seem

tedious to me; this, because I was not a stranger merely witnessing a performance which he does not understand, and in which therefore he can take no interest. I was bearing an effective part in the ceremonies, acting by prayer and song, and so their pure beauty became living and intelligible to me. For art—and religion—only remain true, living and pregnant, so far as they remain in communion with men; and love, which is the first point in ethics, is also the first in esthetics. This is better known to-day, now that it has been seen how misleading was an egoistic art, cutting itself off from common life in a scornful exclusiveness, incapable of sympathy and comprehension.

That was a corollary to the individualism and the anarchic situation of the last century, being a consequence of the French Revolution and throwing its furthest roots as far as the Renaissance. Now a movement of reaction has appeared; the time of absolute liberty seems closed; and the new century prefers discipline and collective organization of the whole of society. It has taken as its motto that of Belgium: "In Union is Strength". One of the results of the present War, and of its deepest significations may well be to show to the world the power of an organized body, with also its faults and its dangers, when this coördination goes as far as deformation by excessively specializing individuals, so that they merely become parts of a machine instead of human beings working together. In all domains there is a tendency toward authority, order, unity. Young people are royalists, nationalists, Catholics; the Trade Unions restore in a democratic state the medieval corporations; new theories, as Jules Romain's *Unanimism,* preach association which, uniting the whole groups in the same emotions, multiplies the value of the individual feeling by all the power of collectivity.

And attempts are made toward social art. It is for instance the Theatre of the People, to which Romain Rolland and Maurice Pottecher in France, have attached their names. To renew dramatic art by making it draw from the fecund sources of popular sap; to put it to the level of the crowd—and that will render it more natural and true; to unite the crowd to the performance, making it participate in the song or the action as in the feasts of May in the country or the grand

political shows of which the French Revolution has given us the image and in which a whole people is acting; to create a new art, expression of a new social order; and it is just because it will express it that it will be living, that the crowd will understand it and be educated by it.

Such may be the ideal of Plain-chant. Attracted by an art which, equally averted from fastidious conventions and insipid devotion, remains natural and true, gained over to it by the contagion of example and the collective force that emanates from it, men will insensibly feel this wholesome and mysterious pressure of which we have already seen the results on the monks. And naturally, from the church, art will radiate on the outside, and following the noble and fruitful ideas which Ruskin had the glory to promote, continue its educational influence by enthroning beauty in the street, in the factory, at home, everywhere in daily life. Then if, thanks to a more reasonable distribution of labor, the workman, being not over-tired and underpaid, can spare some time at the end of his day to cultivate the flower of beauty whose germs are in the heart of every human being, then we may foresee, without being charged with Utopianism, a return to the magnificent flowering of the Middle Ages. In those days, when art was entertained by the collective professional groupings, so that the artisan was not isolated but supported by his corps, his ideas being reinforced and fixed by a sympathetic *milieu,* it was poured on the whole people closely in touch with it. They understood art and so from among the people arose artists unnumbered.

One day perhaps, thanks to that collective feeling of which art, and especially music, is the great medium, we will again witness social faith go on an equal footing with religious faith, and produce a great civilization. A regular clergy, no more scattered and individual as the secular clergy, but in each parish living in community, forming a sort of corporation, being thus stronger in its religious feeling and forming a basis for the daily office sung in the church, would then conduct the cults with magnificence and composure, in the long sonorous naves of the cathedrals, which were also produced by the contribution of all, and the crowd would come to it, and be attentive, and understand, and appreciate, and

by the irresistible unison of the voices and the hearts, lifted in a holy contagion and soaring of faith, would join in the song, so that the music, provoking first the spiritual and interior unity by gathering the soul, would also produce the fraternal unity by gathering men, all feeling brothers, being one also with the clergy that leads the praises; the church would then be really international, its language, Latin, being already international; and finally this whole unity would consume and achieve itself in the mystic and supreme unity with God. Sublime dream!—but was it not perhaps that of Pius X?

For, to look closely into it, the late Pope who, while the whole world was pregnant of a new order and of many great things that might be done, seemed to have only busied himself with questions of liturgy and manners of singing, has perhaps by his keen insight realized most precisely and in their most far-reaching consequences, both the true spirit of the Church, and the currents of our epoch. Who knows if that manner of singing does not contain the future of the Church, and of the world, a complete regeneration, a revolution of both, by music? It may be, indeed, that music is the basis of religion —for both appeal to the heart—and also the basis of the whole body social; preëminently, it is the social art.

The late Pope had the intuition of the true evangelical and Christian spirit of the Church. His was the unconventional, simple, primitive idea of a united family, uncompromising on the spiritual question, seeing nothing but that aim. The members of the Church are the limbs of the sacred body of Christ; they form but one family united under one head. This was ever his ideal, to which he always worked. He wanted to restore regular clergy living in community, in a family, instead of by themselves, and as this collective principle and fraternal character are best expressed and created by Plain-chant, he never ceased to promote it. From the time when he was an assistant priest, he introduced it in his church; as Patriarch of Venice he introduced it in his bishopric, and finally when he was raised to the Supreme Pontificate, one of his first Motu proprios bore on the unification of the liturgies by introducing everywhere the Roman Plain-chant.

The Church aims at salvation by common effort; because religion is love, and love unites, organizes, whereas hatred,

egoism, and worldly passions divide and disorganize. To have had the vision of how the true, and wrongly-neglected spirit of Catholicism fitted with the contemporary cravings, was the glory of Pius X, who appears thus as one of the greatest of pontiffs. He has brought the Church into harmony with the new times, which meet again the old ones; and so religion, by a return to its genuine meaning stands, thanks to him, at the doors of the future.

When the Argonauts on their journey passed by the place where the Syrens by their enchanting voice beguiled travelers to their destruction, Orpheus played his harp and the enchantment of his melodies prevailed over that of the evil genii. Later, when Amphion had to build the walls of Thebes, he struck his lyre, and the very stones of their own accord assembled. These tales were, to the ancients, symbolic of the great power of music. It belongs perhaps to the Roman Church to transform them into realities.

L. VAN ISEGHEM.

Folkestone, England.

THE CANONICAL FORMATION OF PARISHES AND MISSIONS.

IN the first centuries of the Church there were no parishes, as we understand the term, and no parish priests. One church only existed in a diocese, and that in the episcopal city. The whole diocese was called a parish (*parochia*), and the bishop was the sole pastor, being assisted in the care of souls, as in other duties, by his clergy. The fourth century marked the beginning of parishes in rural districts. Urban or city parishes, except in Rome and Alexandria, were unknown before the tenth century. The practical carrying on of the work of the Church demanded the separation of dioceses into definite sections or districts, each with its own pastor to administer to the faithful of that district. Experience induced the Church to insist in her legislation on the institution of parishes. Let it suffice to cite on this question the Council of Trent, which expressly commands bishops, for the better safeguarding of souls, to establish parishes with definite parochial lines, where they do not exist, and to assign to each parish its own permanent rector.

We venture to give the Tridentine decree[1] in an English dress as follows:

Also in those cities and places where the parochial churches have not definite boundaries, and the rectors thereof have not their own proper people to govern, but administer the sacraments indiscriminately to all who desire them, the Holy Synod enjoins on all bishops, in order that the salvation of the souls committed to them may be more secure, that after dividing the people into fixed and distinct parishes, they shall assign to each parish its own permanent and particular parish priest, who may know his own parishioners, and from whom alone they may lawfully receive the sacraments; *or let them make other more suitable provisions, as local needs may require.* They shall also take care that the same be done as soon as possible in those cities and places where no parish churches exist; any privileges and customs, even though immemorial, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Parishes and Parish Priests.

The word *parish* may denote a certain territory circumscribed by fixed limits, or the *people* (coetus fidelium) living within said territory, or a certain *church* in which the parish priest administers to the parishioners, or the *office* or *benefice* to which is attached the cure of souls. A clear, precise definition of a parish is not easily given. Father Santi, S.J.,[2] defines it thus: "Certa dioeceseos ecclesia quae populum certis limitibus distinctum, et presbyterum seu rectorum proprium habet, qui missione accepta ab Episcopo et sub ejus dependentia eidem populo sacramenta, verbum divinum et alia spiritualia *ex officio* administrat." *Parochus* (parish priest), a term which came into general use only during the last sessions of the Council of Trent, is thus defined by Father Wernz, S.J.:[3] "Presbyter legitime deputatus, cui *ex officio* competit *obligatio* et jus nomine *proprio* rite et independenter et plene *exercendi* proprium curam animarum certi numeri fidelium, regulariter intra determinatum territorium dioecesis degentium, qui vicissim ab eodem presbytero sacra recipere aliquatenus tenentur."

Parishes, then, are portions or divisions of a diocese, separated one from another by well defined lines or boundaries. Each parish has its own pastor, who in his own name or of his

[1] Sess. XXIV, c. 13, *De Ref. in fine.*
[2] *Praelect. Juris Can.*, L. III, tit. 29, n. 3.
[3] *Jus Decretalium*, Vol. II, n. 821.

own right, by reason of his office administers spiritually, and in some cases, defined in law, exclusively, to the faithful under his charge. A parish priest has not merely the *right,* but likewise the *obligation* of administering to his people, while they on the other hand must accept parochial ministrations from him. Ordinarily a parish priest's tenure of office is permanent. There are, nevertheless, many exceptions, particularly in regard to the *parochi deservitores* (*desservants*) of France, so that canonists are obliged to maintain that *permanency* is not essential to the definition of a parish priest. Is not this in keeping with the words, given in italics, of the Tridentine decree quoted above? Bishops are commanded to appoint *permanent* parish priests, *or* to make other and *better or more suitable* provisions—better, not *in se,* but because of local necessity or conditions. "Mandat Sancta Synodus Episcopis, ut unicuique (parochiae) suum *perpetuum* peculiaremque parochum assignent aut alio *utiliori* modo, prout loci qualitas exegerit, provideant."

Parishes are distinguished *territorially.* Faithful to the legislation of the Tridentine Council that parishes be established *with definite or fixed boundaries,* the Holy See has ever insisted on the necessity of *parish lines.* The fundamental reason for the existence of parishes demands fixed parochial lines. In civil, as well as in ecclesiastical matters, jurisdiction is exercised chiefly according to territorial lines. The principle established centuries ago—"extra territorium jus dicenti impune non paretur"—is still sound. Who ever heard of the Holy See establishing a new *diocese,* without determining its exact borders? Who will deny that parochial boundaries should be equally definite? And yet we do not maintain that there may not be two or more parishes within the same limits. Parishes of different *rites* surely may occupy the *same* territory. Thus within the same district there may be two or more parish priests of different *rites,* each administering in his own parish or territory to the members of his rite. Custom moreover in some countries recognizes parishes which are established according to nationalities or languages, two or more parishes of different nationalities existing within the same boundaries.[4] Let it be remembered, however, that

[4] Concerning the origin of such parishes in the United States, see Rev. Dr. Weber's article in *The Catholic Historical Review* of January, 1916, page 422.

even in these cases parishes are determined by territorial boundaries, so that all within the established limits, and none who dwells beyond, are parishioners of one or other of these parishes. Canonists admit the existence of such parishes, declaring at the same time that this custom is not contrary to canon law. Rome has never issued a formal approval of this practice. On the contrary, there are indications that the Holy See does not favor the view of canonists in this matter. Possibly the readers of the REVIEW are not familiar with the sentence of the Tribunal of the Sacred Rota under date of 5 August, 1914, in favor of the Bishop of London, Canada. Recourse was had to Rome by a certain pastor against the episcopal decree which divided his parish. The Right Reverend Ordinary was upheld; he was even lauded for his zeal and solicitude in allowing the faithful of the new parish, who might so desire, to frequent the old parish, chiefly on account of the French language which was there in use. The Sacred Rota [5] took occasion to speak as follows of the permission thus granted by His Lordship: "Verum, concessa ab Episcopo Fallon facultas, quamvis eum purgat ab impacta nationalismi accusatione, a Patribus Dominis *admitti et sanciri non potuit*, utpote reprobata in cap. 13, sess. 24 Conc. Tridentini, jubentis unamquamque paroeciam suum determinatum territorium et peculiarem pastorem habere." While these words of the Sacred Rota may not fully cover the point in question concerning parishes according to national lines, they at least direct attention to the mind of Rome. May we not justly expect that the new codification of canon law, long desired and long delayed, may contain definite legislation on this point?

THE FORMATION OF PARISHES.

Parishes are said by canonists to be *created* (creatio), when they are established where parishes did not previously exist. Other methods of erecting a new parish are to divide (dismembratio) one or more existing parishes, or to unite (unio) two or more into one. Bishops must create parishes or quasi-parishes, if at all possible. It is within their province too to divide or unite the parishes of their dioceses, providing a

[5] *Acta Apos. Sedis*, Vol. VII, p. 80.

canonical reason for so doing be verified—mere numbers will not suffice—and certain prescribed formalities be observed. There is a decree by which Pope Alexander III in the twelfth century, writing to the Archbishop of York, England,[6] assigned as a legitimate reason for dividing a parish the too great distance of the faithful from the parish church. The Council of Trent, confirming this enactment, added a second reason, sufficient in law for such division, namely, the difficulty encountered by the people in attending the parish church. The interesting decree of Alexander III is not necessary to our purpose and is too long to quote. The words of the Council of Trent[7] follow: "In iis locis in quibus ob locorum *distantiam* sive *difficultatem* parochiani sine magno incommodo ad percipienda sacramenta, et divina officia audienda accedere non possunt, novas parochias, etiam invitis rectoribus, juxta formam constitutionis Alexandri III quae incipit *Ad audientiam* constituere possint (Episcopi). Illis autem sacerdotibus qui de novo erunt ecclesiis erectis praeficiendis, competens assignetur portio arbitrio Episcopi ex fructibus ad ecclesiam matricem quomodocumque pertinentibus, et si necesse fuerit, compellere possit populum ea subministrare quae sufficiant ad vitam dictorum sacerdotum sustentandam." No absolute rule can be given to determine the exact distance of the parishioners from the church, or the approximate degree of difficulty or inconvenience to which they must be subjected in order to justify a division of a parish. The question is one of fact, in which the decision must be left to the prudent judgment of the bishop, who is to *take heed to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed bishops to rule the Church of God* in their own dioceses, and who may justly be credited with understanding, better than any other, local conditions and needs.

Formerly the division of a parish was considered an *extraordinary* remedy in providing for the spiritual welfare of the faithful. Additional curates or assistants were appointed, or even succursal churches or chapels, without parochial rights, were erected when necessary. These were the ordinary means

[6] Decret. Greg. IX, Lib. III, tit. 48, c. 3, *Ad audientiam.*

[7] Sess. XXI, c. 4, De Ref.

adopted to serve the spiritual wants of the people. About the middle of the eighteenth century, however, because of diminished fervor on the part of the faithful, and the constantly increasing dangers to which faith and morals were subjected, the Holy See became less rigorous in demanding reasons required for the division of a parish. More especially in the past fifty or sixty years has this milder interpretation of the law been confirmed again and again in various decisions of the Congregation of the Council, and lately by the Sacred Rota. Thus a commentator in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* [8] sums up the force of these decisions as an interpretation of law: "Dismembratio (parochiae) olim habita est tantum uti remedium *extremum*; ita ut locum non haberet quoties necessitati consuli potuisset per parochi *vicarium*. A medio fere saeculo elapso (scilicet circa 1750) mitius judicatum est de evidenti Ecclesiae *utilitati*, ita ut haec non confunderetur *cum absoluta necessitate. Hinc praxi recentiori pene nulla habetur ratio de remediis subsidiariis vel extremis. Et quatenus utilitas in animarum bonum* appareat, dismembratio discernitur, *neque facili modo improbatur*, si ab Episcopo facta fuerit, praecipue si dos aut sufficiens reditus non desint pro novo parocho. . . . Nostris hisce temporibus Sacra Concilii Congregatio in diversam ivit sententiam; sapienterque id factum esse deprehendes, si parumper spectes aetatis nostrae ingenium."

In a late decision for the diocese of Sion, or Sitten, in Switzerland,[9] the Sacred Rota speaks thus in regard to this matter: "Praeter distantiam et itineris difficultatem aliae quoque dari possunt dismembrationis causae, uti v. gr. antipathia inter incolas duorum locorum. Interveniente igitur aliqua legitima causa, Episcopus ad dismembrationem procedere poterit. Hoc quoque notandum est, hodiedum dismembrationem *facilius*, et *non* amplius considerari, ut olim, tanquam *remedium extremum*, ad quod recurrendum non sit quoties cura animarum, v. gr. per vicarium provideri potest. Ratio hujus mitioris praxis est, quia hodie depravati mores incautae juventutis, massonicae sectae, quae veluti lupi rapaces furunt ut Christi gregem devorent, nisi necessitatem absolutam, saltem utilitatem porten-

[8] Vol. XIII, append. VI, in fine.

[9] *Acta Apos. Sedis*, Vol. IV, p. 454.

dunt evidentem multiplicandi pastores. Intra populi pastores autem veros *parochos* praeferendos esse *vicariis* nemo non videt."

Reflection will convince us that there is little change on this point in the legislation of the Church. It is rather a question of the *interpretation* of the law, of weighing the *magnum incommodum* of the Tridentine Council, of estimating the difficulty or inconvenience which certain parishioners would necessarily undergo in attending the parochial church. Whether the difficulty experienced arise from the length of the way to be traversed, or from some other cause, has little practical bearing on the case, since "illud solum possumus quod *commode possumus*".[10] *The highest law*, in this matter, as in all others, *is the salvation of souls*. Parishes are made for the people, not for the pastors.

Formalities Prescribed.

The existence of a canonical cause, which consists in the accommodation or convenience of the faithful, as explained above, is not the only requirement for the division of a parish. Certain formalities must be observed. First of all the consent of the cathedral chapter (except in certain cases where the bishop is acting as the delegate of the Holy See, or there is a recognized custom, as in France, to the contrary) is demanded for the validity of the episcopal decree, by virtue of which the division of a parish is authorized. The reason for this is that the consent of the cathedral chapter is required for the alienation of church property. The division of a parish is considered a species of alienation, since it carries with it ordinarily a division or diminution of the income of the parochial benefice. Moreover a bishop must obtain the permission, expressed by a majority vote, of his chapter to *unite* two or more parishes; hence also to *divide* a parish, according to the canonical principle, "omnis res per quascumque causas nascitur, per easdem dissolvitur".[11]

Let it be noted that the consent of the cathedral chapter is required for the *division* of a parish, not however for the establishing of the lines of demarcation between the new and

[10] L. Nepos Proculo, ff. de verb. signif., 125.
[11] Reg. I Decret. Greg. IX.

the old parish. These confines may be determined by the bishop. The decision (2 April, 1912) of the Sacred Rota for a Swiss diocese, quoted above, has confirmed this principle of law. We append the objection offered, together with its solution: "Difficultas solummodo adesse videtur quoad capituli consensum, qui quidem obtentus fuit die 14 Septembris 1907, sed tantum pro erigenda parochia in parte exteriore seu in Ausserbalen. Episcopus vero, decreto die 27 Septembris 1907, parochiam erexit complectentem totam Balen, scilicet tum exteriorem tum interiorem, quod *contra capituli mentem et conditionem* fuisse asserit pars adversa; proinde nullus est dicendus capituli consensus. Ad quam objectionem Domini Auditores animadverterunt, capituli consensum requiri quidem substantialiter seu sub poena nullitatis pro dismembratione in genere, *non autem in specie pro modo et forma* quibus dismembratio est facienda. Modus enim et forma pendent ab Episcopi prudenti arbitrio. Unde decreta de consensu capituli dismembratione in genere, *Episcopi est,* dotem novae paroeciae assignandam praefinire, territorium delineare, aliaque similia peragere, et quidem *absque novo capituli consensu vel consilio.*"

Another formality to be observed in dividing a parish is the citation and hearing of those whose interests are at stake, as rectors of the parishes that are to undergo division, and those who enjoy "jus patronatus". This requisite, however, is of minor importance in comparison with the other concerning the consent of the cathedral chapter. The citation and hearing of those whose interests are involved, while prescribed, is not essential, is not required for a valid or legal division of a parish. Much less will their dissent or positive refusal to consent to a division prevent the erection of the proposed parish. Ordinarily the rector of the old parish has more at interest than others, as greater harm would result to him than to any one else from a division, which nearly always implies some financial loss. Yet the Council of Trent [12] declares that, given a canonical cause for the division of a parish, the bishop may proceed, notwithstanding the objection of the pastor ("etiam invitis rectoribus"). The opportunity

[12] Sess. XXI, c. 4, De Ref.

given to rectors to express their views serves to establish better the canonical grounds for the division, and when such cause is extant, the rector who opposes the erection of the new parish is "irrationabiliter invitus". The only objection in law that a pastor can offer to the division of his parish is that there is no canonical reason for the division, that such division would not prove more beneficial to the salvation of souls.

Parishioners have no voice regarding the advisability of dividing a parish, though they may be questioned concerning the existence of the required canonical reason for such division. The laity, too, though objecting strongly to the division of a parish, may be compelled to support properly the new rector.[13]

The Holy See in her decisions has always upheld these principles. The Swiss decision of the Sacred Rota, mentioned above, puts the matter very nicely [14] in the following words: "Citatio vero et auditio illorum quorum interest, ad substantiam seu pro validitate dismembrationis *haud* requiruntur. Multo minus illorum dissensus valorem divisionis impedire potest, uti patet ex capite *Ad audientiam,* et ex ipso Tridentino, juxta quod Episcopus ad divisionem paroeciae, si vere canonica adsit causa, procedere potest etiam invitis rectoribus, nempe illegitime invitis, nam rectores ecclesiarum sunt legitime inviti, et hinc audiendi, si deest dismembrationis causa canonica. In specie nullus habetur juris canonici textus qui praescribat in paroeciarum dismembratione exquiri debere consensum populi, et hoc merito quidem, nam quaestio canonica, qualis est dismembratio parochiarum, non ex populi consensu vel dissensu est definienda. Imo tantum abest ut pro dismembratione requiratur populi consensus, ut populus, si dismembrationis adsit causa canonica, compelli possit ad alimenta novo parocho subministranda (Conc. Trid. l. c.). Unde etiam ex recentiori praxi S. C. Concilii citatio eorum quorum interest, contra antiquam disciplinam et antiquos auctores, non consideratur tanquam forma, qua neglecta, nulla sit dismembratio, sed solum tanquam solemnitas quae conferat ad causae cognitionem et ad declinandum praejudicium." [15]

[13] See quotation above from Council of Trent.

[14] *Acta Apos. Sedis,* Vol. IV, p. 455.

[15] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis,* Vol. III, p. 396 et Vol. X, pp. 271 ff.

Furthermore, canon law requires that in establishing a new parish provision must be made for the equipment and needs of the church and the support of the rector. The sum (*dos*) considered necessary is determined by the bishop and is often taken from the funds of the old parish. In this case the rector of the old church ("ecclesia matrix") is usually granted "jus patronatus" over the new parish ("ecclesia filialis"), which in turn pays a nominal sum annually to the old parish. Where the original parish is not able to meet these financial obligations, the new church must be financed by the people. We may note in passing that when the new parish does not seek financial aid from the old parish, there is less reason to object to the division.

This point too is covered by a recent decision of the Sacred Rota given to the diocese of Bobbio in Italy: "Praeterea minus attendenda est Patribus oppositio facta ab ecclesia parochiali, quippe *ejus dos non proprie dividitur,* sed tantummodo dismembratur territorium: et sane territorii parochialis pro parte avulsio seu divisio, est minus odiosa in jure, quam ipsa praebendarum divisio. . . . Porro dismembratio quae suapte natura est odiosa et hinc habet resistentiam juris communis, in casu eo minus est dicenda odiosa quo minor est alienatio jurium veteris ecclesiae cujus dos nullimode depauperatur, saltem directe." [16]

No Appeal.

From the bishop's decree ordaining the division of a parish there is no suspensive appeal. In the decretal of Alexander III *Ad audientiam* this is expressly stated: "sublato appellationis obstaculo, appellationis cessante diffugio". The Tridentine Synod retains these forms. These expressions, nevertheless, do not prohibit an appeal which has merely a devolutive effect.

Union of Parishes.

Not only by creation or division may parishes be formed, but likewise by union. It is not necessary to go into this phase of the question in detail. Suffice it to say that the canonical reasons for uniting parishes and the formalities prescribed do not vary essentially from those given above. Since

[16] *Acta Apos. Sedis,* Vol. III, p. 209.

however such unions are not to work harm to rectors, for, as the Council of Trent [17] puts it, they are to be made "sine praejudicio obtinentium", the episcopal decree by which the union is enacted, does not become effective till after the death or voluntary resignation of the actual incumbent of the parish in question.

Practical Questions.

It might be asked whether a bishop may for the greater convenience of the people change the lines or boundaries of existing parishes, separating a certain territory or district from one parish and attaching it to another, when the erection of a new parish is not considered advisable. Canonists are divided on this question. Some maintain that even though a canonical cause sufficient for the erection of a new parish exist, the bishop *may not* or at least *should not* change existing boundaries without authorization from the Holy See. However, if it is within the rights of a bishop to erect a new parish by dividing one which is in existence, why deny his authority to do *what is less,* namely, to alter existing boundaries, when the spiritual needs of the people demand it? Some canonists have possibly been led astray owing to the fact that the Sacred Congregation of the Council reversed, in one or two cases, episcopal decrees in this matter. The reversal however was based not on *lack of authority* on the part of the bishop to alter existing boundaries, but because of failure to prove *a canonical reason* for the change. On the other hand decisions of the S. Council in support of the episcopal authority in this matter are not wanting.

Should bishops establish definite boundaries between parishes, where such do not exist? Why not? That bishops *may* do so is apparent from the foregoing. That bishops *should* do so there can be no doubt. Such is the law. The Church knows no parish except one circumscribed by definite limits. Aside from the misunderstandings among rectors to which the disputed territory gives rise, experience shows that many living in neutral territory are careless in religious practices. If admonished by Rector A, they claim to belong to Rector

[17] Sess. XXI, c. 5, De Ref.

B, and vice versa. As occasionally marriages are performed in private houses, the contract may easily be exposed to nullity in a district where parish lines are uncertain. This is true even when one of the contracting parties is in danger of death, for an unauthorized priest cannot validly assist at such marriage, "nisi parochus vel loci Ordinarius vel ab alterutro delegatus haberi nequeat". Who is the *parochus* to delegate in such cases?

At what distance from the parish church are the boundaries to be placed? Let the bishop decide, placing them where they will best serve the convenience of the people. The laity usually will attend, if not the nearest, at least the most convenient church, and boundaries ordinarily should be determined accordingly.

Missions.

Missions are quasi-parishes. The great difference between a parish and a mission is that the incumbent of the former, the parish priest, administers his parish *ex officio* or in his own name, while the rector of a mission does not, but rather holds the position of *vicar* to the bishop. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (n. 124) decreed that in all the provinces of the United States, and especially in the larger cities, where there are several churches, certain districts, like parishes, with defined limits should be assigned to each church and that parochial or quasi-parochial rights should be given to the rectors of such churches. This decree was confirmed by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (n. 24). This discipline is in keeping with the spirit of common law and with the wishes of the Holy See.

Where missions, and not parishes strictly so-called, exist, reasons less weighty than those discussed above will suffice for their division. Our guide in this matter is particularly the Constitution of Pope Leo XIII *Romanos Pontifices,* which was issued in 1881 for England, and later extended to the United States, Canada and the Philippine Islands.

In regard to the present question this Constitution (§ Profecto) says: "Ad divisionem missionis simplicis ea juris solemnia transferenda non sunt quae super dismembratione paroeciarum fuerunt constituta, eo vel magis quod, propter

missionis indolem et peculiaries circumstantias, *numero plures ac leviores causae* possint occurrere, quae istarum divisionem suadeant, quam quae jure definitae sint ut fiat paroeciarum divisio."

The bishop, not the rector, much less the laity, is to determine whether sufficient cause exist for the division of a mission. All that has been said in regard to parochial boundaries applies also to missions. In the absence of cathedral chapters, the opinion, *not the consent,* of the diocesan consultors concerning the division must be sought. It is prescribed too that the rector of the mission, which is to be divided, be heard. This, nevertheless, is not essential for the lawful institution of the new mission or quasi-parish. If the mission be in charge of Religious, it is the superior general who is consulted. A mission is not an ecclesiastical *benefice.* No determined or fixed revenue is necessary for the establishing of a new mission. Missions and their rectors are supported by the voluntary offerings of the faithful. The income of a mission is by its very nature indefinite and fluctuating. It is contrary to the canons for a priest to hold two *parishes.* If a priest have two *missions,* no formality is required in depriving him of one of them. To separate one mission from another, by giving a pastor to each, is not to divide a mission. "Salus animarum lex suprema."

E RUCUPIS.

THE PASSIONISTS IN IRELAND.

STEPS are being taken to have the cause of the beatification of the saintly Passionist, Father Charles Houban, introduced before the Apostolic Tribunal in Rome. He was a remarkable figure in the religious life of Dublin from 1857 to 1893, and largely helped to make St. Paul's Retreat, Mount Argus, what it is, a great source of spiritual influence in the Irish metropolis.

John Andrew Houban, son of Peter Joseph and Jane Elizabeth Houban (née Luyten) was born on 11 December, 1821, in Munster-Geleen (*Monasterium Geleenense*) in the diocese of Roermund, province of Limbourg, Holland. The Limbourgians are noted for their inflexible and unswerving adher-

ence to the Faith, to which they clung with tenacity amid all the religious and political vicissitudes through which Holland, like Germany, passed, when the mailed hands of the Protestant rulers strove might and main to force them to accept Lutheranism, in which they were opposed by the Emperor Ferdinand and the Catholic nobles. When, defeated at the battle of Prague, the Elector and his beaten army fled into Holland, his Lutheran soldiers tried to get a foothold in Limbourg, but the Limbourgians rushed to arms and drove them out.

Limbourg is, to this day, thoroughly Catholic. Nowhere on the European Continent are Catholic priests and clerics more respected than in the Catholic districts of Holland. It is noteworthy that never are Catholics more closely knit together as a body, more staunch and militant than when they have been put upon their mettle and have had to oppose a united front to innovations or arbitrary infringements upon their civil or religious liberty.

It was, therefore, in an atmosphere and amid surroundings favorable to his growth in holiness that the early life of young Houban was passed. He was one of a large family; for the anti-social virus of modern teaching that inculcates their limitation—an outrage upon nature that entails its own punishment—had not infected Dutch Catholic homes. His pious mother lived to see many of her children and grandchildren enter religion.

His holiness was the outcome of his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. Its development dates from his first Communion, which he made in 1835. After that, all the time at his disposal was spent in prayer before the Tabernacle or at the altar of Our Lady; reverence for the Word Incarnate under the Eucharistic veil was associated in his mind with reverence to her upon whose "Fiat mihi" humanly depended the Incarnation, of which the mystery of the Real Presence is, according to St. Thomas of Aquin, a prolongation. His peaceful, happy life of prayer and study in the rural district in which he lived was interrupted in 1840 when, in accordance with the law of conscription introduced into Holland by Napoleon I, he had to join the army. But a military career was not that for which he was destined; he was to serve in the ranks of the Church Militant, to be a soldier of the Cross. A

substitute for him was found, and so he was free to return home and pursue his studies until he was twenty-four, when he joined the Passionists who had just founded a house at Ere, in Belgium, of which Father Dominic of the Mother of God,[1] who received Newman into the Church at Littlemore, was the first rector. It was Father Peter, his successor when he left for England, who admitted young Houban. He was invested with the habit on 8 December, 1845, taking the name of Confrater Charles of St. Andrew; was professed on 10 December, 1846, and on the 21st of December, 1850, was ordained priest. Even as a novice he had already come to be regarded as a saint by his religious brethren; and the impression deepened as time went on.

On 5 February, 1851, he joined the community at Aston in Staffordshire, whither he was sent to assist his brethren in the work of the reconversion of England in which it was foreshown in a vision to St. Paul of the Cross that his spiritual children would have a large share, and to which blessed work Father Dominic had recently put his holy hand, or rather his whole heart and soul; for the peasant from the Apennines, while praying before an image of the Madonna, had received his call to preach the Gospel in a northern land that had fallen away from the unity of Christendom, and, becoming a Passionist, was chiefly instrumental in realizing the vision and views of the founder of the Congregation.

At Aston Father Charles first came in contact with Irish Catholics, victims of the great famine which had cast so many hundreds of them on the shores of England, and learnt to appreciate their good qualities, particularly their reverence for the priestly office. On 12 November, 1854, he was appointed Vice-Master at St. Wilfrid's, the novitiate house in Staffordshire, so named by Faber who there, in conjunction with Newman, planned the introduction of the Oratorians into England. The years from 1857 to 1866 were spent in Ireland; and, after a sojourn in Broadway in Worcestershire, to which the novitiate had been transferred, he left England for good on 10 January, 1874, recrossing the Channel to devote himself for the rest of his life to the Irish mission.

[1] The Cause of his Beatification is proceeding.

The advent of the Passionists in Ireland was epoch-making. It marked a distinct advance in the work of missions to which St. Alphonsus Liguori attached so much importance. The first mission they gave in Ireland was at St. Audoen's in High Street, Dublin, one of the oldest parishes in the city. It was opened on 29 April, 1849, and closed on 20 May and was conducted by the celebrated Father Dominic. That was the only mission he ever gave in Ireland and the last of his life, for he died 27 August ensuing. The bishops welcomed their arrival. They were encouraged by Cardinal Cullen to make a foundation in Dublin; by Dr. Vaughan, Bishop of Killaloe, who offered one in Nenagh, in North Tipperary; and by Dr. Denvir in Belfast, where now they are located at Ardoyne. The first foundation was at Mount Argus, Harold's Cross, a southern suburb of Dublin, where a tall, red-brick dwelling-house with grounds was acquired for the purpose at a little over two thousand pounds. The site was ideal. "Not wholly in the busy world, nor quite beyond it," like Tennyson's garden, it stands upon an elevation from which an extensive view of the open country stretching away to the Dublin mountains is obtained. Far removed from the noise and traffic of a crowded city, and approached by a side road skirting Mount Jerome Cemetery, where rest the remains of Thomas Davis, it is a place admirably suited for a religious retreat; silent, secluded and restful, where a meditative mind gazing at the sylvan scenery may "look through nature up to nature's God".

Harold's Cross was not always so peaceful or suggestive of religious thought. A place of great antiquity, it is supposed to have derived its name from the defeat and death of a Danish king, Harold; for the district during the Scandinavian invasion was frequently the scene of sanguinary encounters between the Norsemen and the native Irish, who disputed the ground with the invaders. The fighting spirit continued long to prevail. Down to near our own time Harold's Cross was notorious for riots, arising out of faction fights between stalwarts from the Dublin mountains and the city folk, who kept up a kind of intermittent guerilla warfare; while mixed crowds, disporting around the maypole which stood in the centre of the green—now converted into a pretty miniature

park—led to drinking, quarrels, disorderly conduct, until Father Henry Young appeared upon the scene and effected a thorough reform.

St. Paul's Retreat, the name the Passionists gave Mount Argus, was taken possession of on 15 August, 1856. Its first Rector was the Hon. and Rev. Paul Mary Pakenham, a nephew of the Duke of Wellington, victor of Waterloo, and the convert son of the second Earl of Longford. With this foundation, and the Convent of the Poor Clares and the Hospice for the Dying at opposite sides of the main road, the Church, in taking possession, so to speak, of Harold's Cross was recovering lost ground; for the whole district at one time was ecclesiastical property. It is traditionally recorded that St. Patrick preached there, and that the stones with which St. Patrick's Cathedral (now in Protestant hands) was built, were taken from a quarry at Harold's Cross, and passed on from hand to hand by a continuous line of men toiling from sunrise to sunset—"a fair type", observes Lady Fullerton, "of the work performed by the Irish race during the long ages in which they have, silently, patiently, unceasingly, transmitted from father to son, from generation to generation, the spiritual stones which have raised the Church in faith and beauty to be the wonder and consolation of the faithful in all lands".

Father Charles's arrival at Mount Argus in July, 1857, coincided with the death of its first Rector. He was accompanied by the zealous convert, Father Ignatius Spencer, a near relative of the late Lord Spencer, the Irish Viceroy who held office during the troubled times in Irish politics so graphically described by T. D. Sullivan. His coming also coincided with the extension of the foundation. As the original little chapel was too small to contain the increasing congregation, a larger one was erected within the short space of three months. A new Retreat, described as "the noblest religious house erected in these countries since the Reformation", replaced the red-brick house in which they were first domiciled; and three years afterward was laid the corner-stone of the present church, a splendid specimen of the Romanesque style of architecture.

Meanwhile, Father Charles had no sooner begun his ministrations than people frequenting Mount Argus, with an intuitive perception characteristic of their faith, saw that he was no ordinary priest. There is something like an electric current in the transmission of ideas from one to another. Persons who had been to confession to him spoke of the remarkable impression he made and the influence they felt that he possessed, as well as of the healing power of his simple blessing. His penitents multiplied, until his confessional was besieged from morning till night. His name became a household word in the city. Wherever he visited the entire household, members of the family and domestics, would meet him in the hall and kneel for his blessing. It is noted that worldly-minded men who would think it beneath their dignity to salute a priest, would treat him with exceptional reverence; while groups of citizens, when they saw him driving or walking through the streets, would kneel to receive his benediction. It was the same when he went into the country. When he visited Glendalough and the valley of the seven churches in 1860—a hallowed spot as calculated to arouse religious emotions as Iona—the sick and infirm were brought in cars and carts from the surrounding district to be blest and healed. The same scene was repeated at Killarney, Navan, and elsewhere. When at Mount Argus, it was usually at Our Lady's Grotto he blessed the crowds who daily thronged the grounds and who, at his instance, joined him in saying the Stations of the Five Wounds as they proceeded thither, the good priest leading the way with uncovered head. To perform this charitable function he had to come down from his cell on the top floor of the convent. This cell was a narrow room with a solitary window, bare white-washed walls, a few devotional prints, a chair, a table, a bedstead with straw mattress, a crucifix, and a discipline of which he made frequent use. Whenever he was wanted, he was sure to be found either in this cell or absorbed in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament. He was known to pass entire nights prostrate on the floor of his cell. On one of these occasions, exhausted nature gave way, and he was found in the early morning in a swoon on the floor. His bed had not been lain on during the whole night. When asked why he prayed so long, his only answer was, "Tempta-

tion, temptation". Such wrestlings of the spirit are common to all who strive to lead the higher life. One day, after ordinations in the Passionist church, his physician went up to his cell to see him, and, having knocked, entered. He never forgot the sight that met his eyes. The holy man was rapt in ecstasy, quite motionless, with his gaze apparently riveted on some vision, visible only to him. He was wholly unconscious of anyone else being in the room, until the doctor touched his arm. "Oh," he exclaimed, "I was praying for the newly-ordained priests." He interpreted literally St. Paul's injunction to "pray without ceasing". Father Austin writes: "Whoever beheld the wan face of Father Charles, when the rays of the sanctuary lamp flickered upon it, as he knelt gazing upon the door of the Tabernacle, could not but think that within his soul there was a heavenly rapture, and a longing to be at home with Jesus in the unseen world. His very appearance was an incentive to all who observed him to a greater love for the Blessed Sacrament. "His reverence for the mystery of the altar was such that he always uncovered his head when he heard the Blessed Sacrament named. Tears poured from his eyes while he celebrated. Every day, after saying his own Mass, he heard all the Masses he possibly could, or served the Masses of some of his brother priests.

He never lost his first fervor. A Passionist who lived two years with him at Ere and seven in Dublin says that the same fervor which had distinguished him as a student had in no way diminished, but had increased, even as the early brightness of the morning dawn increased to the perfect light of noonday. A priest from Australia who visited Mount Argus in 1892 thus described his impressions: "It was with feelings of the deepest interest that I took up my abode in the monastery hallowed by his presence. The manner of life, the mode of action, and the equanimity of disposition of this son of St. Paul of the Cross were diligently observed by me. Deeply edified by the sight, I could not refrain from noting the signs of extraordinary sanctity that were abundantly manifest. The crowds constantly *en evidence* to seek his blessing, the requests for a share in his prayers continually coming from all climes, and the gratitude evinced for a favorable response to his orisons—all bespeak the unusual." His brethren, the daily

witnesses of his life, held him in great reverence. Groups of them during recreation would kneel around him for his blessing; the highest superior as well as the humblest lay brother considering it a great privilege to obtain it.

Father Austin thus traces a pen-portrait of the holy man: "No one could be in the presence of Father Charles, even for a few moments, without being impressed by his striking personality. He was tall, of a strong, well-built, muscular physique, but attenuated, and toward the end of his life, stooping. His face, rugged in outline and sallow in complexion, bore traces of firmness of character. The forehead was wide, the nose prominent, and the lustre of his hazel eyes reflected the inward beauty of his soul. When animated, his face wore an expression of singular brightness and sweetness."

Miracles were wrought by him; or, to express it more correctly, through his instrumentality. Faith was, of course, the operating cause; faith in the healer and the healed. Faith was the dominant note of his sanctity. It was that which made him realize so vividly the omnipresence of the Divinity —"in whom we live, move and have our being", upon whose volition our existence depends—and the Real Presence on our altars, as if his gaze penetrated through the Eucharistic veil. It was faith which made him a man of prayer; which inspired his active charity, his compassion for the multitude; which enabled him to combine the active with the contemplative life in such perfect harmony that his meditations and raptures did not interfere with the fulfilment of his daily duties or his service of the people.

Some marvelous cures are recorded which completely exclude the supposition of suggestion, that stock argument, that favorite hypothesis of the modern rationalist. Suggestion may occasionally be operative in purely neurotic maladies, but no amount of suggestion will cure cancer of the upper lip complicated with *cancrum oris*; will transform an emaciated youth, reduced to a living skeleton weighing ninety-five pounds, into a robust man of two hundred and twenty-four pounds; will enable a crippled and dumb girl to immediately get up and walk and speak; will restore sight to the blind; will cure a child of an abscess which burrowed so deeply as almost to lay bare the bone, while septic matter was absorbed

from the ulcers, and, humanly speaking, the only chance of saving its life was amputation; will restore to another child the use of its limbs, and quickly infuse new life and vigor into those of a woman suffering from chronic rheumatism, whose case was pronounced hopeless by the doctors. Yet such are among the marvels related of Father Charles, and supported by credible testimony. There is only one obvious explanation.

The man whose simple blessing did all this; whose name was on every lip; whose fame was not only noised abroad all over England and Ireland, but reached America and the Antipodes, was one of the humblest of men, poorly clad and the solitary occupant of a cell which denoted his love of poverty and abnegation; who, in his humility, obeyed even those who had no authority over him and would ask permission for everything he did of the brother who usually accompanied him when he went out; who on Fridays, in memory of Him who was "obedient even unto death", would prostrate himself on the ground before the religious and implore their prayers for "a poor sinner" (himself) and accuse himself publicly in the refectory of his "faults and imperfections", begging the superior to impose a penance for them; and who was often (when he fancied he was alone) overheard saying, "After all my confessions, all my Communions, all my Masses, I am full of sin". It reminds one of St. Francis of Assisi calling himself *vile omiccuolo* and *una vilissima creatura,* and bidding Fra Leone speak of him as one who had committed "tanti mali e tanti peccati nel secolo"; or of the Curé of Ars longing for some solitude where he might "weep over his poor sins".

Great and widespread was the sorrow when, worn out as much by his austerities as by a painful illness, the saintly Passionist passed away calmly without a struggle on the morning of Thursday, 5 January, 1893. The remarkable scenes which took place at his obsequies and interment are still remembered by many who witnessed them; how for four days people came from far and near to gaze for the last time on the placid features of the dead religious; how eager multitudes crowded in large numbers around the coffin, anxious to touch the body with rosary beads and other devotional objects, to be ever

after preserved as mementoes; how some cut off bits of his habit; how a body of strong men had to form themselves into a living rampart to guard the venerated remains; how one of the Order told the story of his edifying life to the listening multitude in such touching terms that preacher and congregation were moved to tears; how before the coffin lid was screwed down an eminent doctor, having examined the body, pronounced it quite flexible, contrary to the ordinary course of nature; and how at length it was deposited in the little "God's acre" under the shadow of the church, in a grave beneath spreading beech trees, with its simple wooden cross, where groups of mourners knelt until the twilight deepened into nightfall, and a silence fell upon the suburb which harmonized with the solemn stillness of death.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

CRUCIFIXES OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS.

THERE are times and circumstances under which it is not possible for many people to make the Way of the Cross in a church or chapel. At the same time it is not easy to obtain permission to have the Way of the Cross erected in private houses. In order, therefore, to give the faithful an opportunity to gain the numerous indulgences attached to the devotion of the Way of the Cross, the Franciscan Fathers of St. Bonaventure's Convent at Rome asked the Holy See for permission to bless crucifixes by the use of which under certain conditions the indulgences of the Way of the Cross might be gained.

The document of request and concession reads as follows: "The infirm, people on voyage, those detained in prison, and people living in heathen countries, as well as those who are legitimately hindered from visiting the Way of the Cross (in a place where the Stations are erected), ask the consolation that they may be able to gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross when placed in such conditions, by reciting fourteen Our Fathers and Hail Marys and at the end five Our Fathers and Hail Marys, holding in their hands a crucifix of copper or bronze which has been blessed by a Guardian or a

higher superior subject to the Most Rev. Father General of the Order of Friars Minor residing at Ara Coeli." Pope Clement XIV granted the request according to the petition, 26 January, 1773. The original document of concession is preserved in the archives of the convent of St. Bonaventure at Rome and is also found embodied in a decree of the S. Congregation of Indulgences, 8 August, 1859.[1]

The following conditions are required to gain the indulgences by using such a crucifix:

1. The corpus of the crucifix must be of copper or other solid material.

2. The ordinary power of blessing the crucifixes rests with the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor and the other superiors of that Order. The Father General can give this faculty to any priest.

3. The manner of blessing the crucifixes consists in making the sign of the cross over the crucifix or several of them.

4. This crucifix can be used to gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross in cases only in which one is hindered by either physical or moral impossibility to go to a church or chapel where the Stations are erected.

5. The indulgences are gained by saying twenty Our Fathers and Hail Marys while holding the crucifix in one's hands.

I add a few words of explanation to each of these points:

1. The crucifix must be of solid material, that is to say, the corpus attached to the cross should be of brass, bronze, copper, iron, or some such material not easily breakable. The S. Congregation of Indulgences, 8 August, 1859, in a decree referred to in footnote No. 1, declared that easily-destructible material cannot serve for that purpose, and lead was included under the head of unfit material for crucifixes as well as other objects that are to be blessed. The cross itself may be of wood or any other material, and if one desire the corpus may be taken from the cross and attached to another cross without loss of the indulgences, according to a declaration of the S. Congregation of Indulgences, 11 April, 1840.[2]

[1] *Decreta Authentica*, No. 378.

[2] *Decreta Auth.*, No. 281 ad 6um. ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. 3, page 147.

Crucifixes that are made of one piece of metal so that the corpus cannot be separated are valid if only the corpus is not merely engraved but somewhat prominent after the manner of a bas-relief. S. Congregation of Indulg., 24 May, 1883.[3]

Several authors explain the *solid material* of which the crucifix must be to include hard wood, bone, ebony, mother-of-pearl, and they seem to be right for the reason that the Holy See allows other religious articles made of such material to be blessed with indulgences though the ancient rule for such articles was the same as for the crucifixes that they had to be of *materia solida.*

The crucifixes must not be so small as to have only the length of an inch or two, for in such cases the corpus to which alone the indulgences are attached will be so small that the figure has hardly the likeness of a human body. Pope Pius IX, in an audience given to a great number of priests in 1867, declared before blessing their objects of devotion that he did not intend to bless the crucifixes the images of which did not have any human likeness. Pope Pius X made the same remark in an audience given to priests of the Franciscan Order, from the College of St. Anthony, Rome.

The " Beads of the Way of the Cross " cannot serve for the purpose of gaining the indulgences of the Stations, nor any painted or engraved picture of the crucifixion, nor finally a cross without the corpus. By a decree of the Holy Office, 24 July, 1912,[4] all faculties to bless with the indulgences of the Way of Cross beads or any other article except a crucifix were revoked from the day of the publication of this decree, and all such faculties formerly conceded were declared null and void.

In the Formula T, No. 22, of the faculties given to the bishops of Canada and other countries, and which will be granted also to the bishops of the United States after the time for the faculties known as Formulas C, D, E has expired, the bishops get the faculty both to erect the Stations of the Way of the Cross and to attach the indulgences to *images of Christ Crucified and to crosses.* From the text of the new decree it follows that this faculty has to be modified in as far

[3] *Acta Ordinis Minorum,* Vol. 10, page 187.

[4] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Vol. 4, page 529. ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. 47, page 465.

as images and simple crosses are concerned, so that the bishops can bless only crucifixes as described above. The same is to be said of concessions made perhaps to some Order, as for example that which the Redemptorist Fathers used to have, they all will have to conform to the rule of blessing only crucifixes with the indulgences of the Stations. It may be also noted that the faculty T given to the bishops does not allow them to delegate that faculty to others unless they get the special faculty to subdelegate expressly either from the Holy See or the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor.

2. The right to bless the crucifixes for the purpose of gaining the indulgences of the Way of the Cross rests with the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor and all actual superiors of canonical convents as well as the small residences, and the heads of Provinces, Custodies and Commissariates where such commissaries are directly under the jurisdiction of the Minister General. This is evident from the decree of Pope Clement XIV cited above. Concerning superiors of small houses, called residences, there was doubt, wherefore a special declaration conceding them the favor was secured by the Order, 11 August, 1863.[5] In the absence of the superior of a house the lawfully appointed vicar has the right to bless the crucifixes. Other priests of the Order do not have the faculty, neither can any superior, except Father General, give them this power. The Father General can, however, delegate priests both of his Order and also any others. The priests can easily obtain the faculty by applying to the Most Rev. Father General, Collegio S. Antonio, Via Merulana 124, Rome, Italy. In recent years a small alms of about twenty-five cents for the benefit of the Holy Shrines in Palestine was demanded with the granting of the faculty.

For the time that the European war lasts Pope Benedict XV granted, 11 Nov., 1915,[6] that all the priests who are chaplains in the army or navy may bless crucifixes for the soldiers to gain the indulgences during the war, and that five Our Fathers and Hail Marys with "Glory be to the Father" may be sufficient if they do not have time to say the twenty that are otherwise prescribed.

[5] *Acta Minorum*, Vol. I, page 132.
[6] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. VII, page 496.

3. Concerning the manner of blessing the crucifixes, it may be noted that the sign of the cross made over the crucifixes with the intention of attaching the indulgences is sufficient. The expression used in the indult of blessing the crucifixes *in forma Ecclesiae consueta* was declared to mean nothing else than the sign of the cross.[7] Other indulgences may also be attached to the crucifixes either before or after or at the same time that the indulgences of the Stations are put on it. If one has the faculties to attach various indulgences to religious articles, all may be given by one sign of the cross, provided no special formula is required for blessing some particular object.

It must be remembered that the person who first used such a crucifix to gain the indulgences cannot give it to another, for no one else can gain them after the crucifix has been used but it would have to be blessed over again for a second person. The general prohibition affecting all blessed objects strictly forbids selling articles of devotion after they have been blessed even though the price is not raised on account of the blessing. Indulgenced objects lose the indulgences by the very fact of their being bought or sold after they have been blessed.[8] If, however, such religious objects are bought and the buyer requests the seller to have them blessed for him, the price agreed to and the expenses of shipment need not be paid immediately but after the receipt of the blessed objects; so also with the crucifixes of the Way of the Cross. S. Congregation of Indulgences, 10 July, 1896.[9]

4. As to the question under what conditions or circumstances one may gain the indulgences of the Way of the Cross by using the crucifix, we notice that Pope Clement XIV, in the document of concession, says that this favor is given for the benefit of the sick, prisoners, travelers on the ocean, to those living in heathen countries where churches and chapels are few and far between, and to all others who are legitimately impeded from making the Stations in a church or chapel. Generally this last phrase is explained to the effect that any moral impossibility to visit the church just now when one desires to

[7] *Decr. Auth.*, No. 313 ad 4um.
[8] *Decr. Auth.*, No. 87 and 344 ad 2um.
[9] *Acta S. Sedis*, Vol. 29, page 320.

make the Stations is sufficient. Therefore all those who are a considerable distance away from the church, or who cannot well leave the house, either for want of time or other considerations, or finally those for whom it would mean a considerable inconvenience to go to church for this devotion; all these individuals can make use of the crucifix blessed with the indulgences of the Way of the Cross. If, however, one could just as well go to a church or chapel to make the Stations there but does not want to undergo even a slight inconvenience, such a one cannot gain the indulgences at home.

5. The prayers to be said in order to gain the indulgences are fourteen Our Fathers and Hail Marys, one for each Station, and five in honor of the Passion of Christ, one Our Father and Hail Mary for the intentions of the Holy Father. These must be said without interruption while holding the blessed crucifix in one's hands. Though the original concession by Pope Clement XIV required only nineteen Our Fathers and Hail Marys, still the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences declared that the one Our Father and Hail Mary for the intentions of the Church must be added (8 August, 1859).[10]

For the benefit of people who are very sick and cannot easily say the twenty Our Fathers and Hail Marys, the Holy See allowed the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor to change these prayers into an act of contrition to be said by them, together with the verse, "Thee therefore we beseech to come to the aid of Thy servants whom Thou hast redeemed by Thy precious blood", and that they follow mentally the recitation of three Our Fathers, Hail Marys and "Glory be to the Father", said by someone else for them.[11]

If several people wish to recite the twenty Our Fathers and Hail Marys together it will suffice for the purpose of gaining the indulgences that one person hold in his hands a blessed crucifix.[12] It is not necessary to say these prayers kneeling, but one must abstain from occupations that would interfere with internal attention to prayer, for the indulgences could not be gained while one is occupied with distracting work.[13]

[10] *Decr. Auth.*, No. 387 ad 1um.
[11] ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. 7, page 318.
[12] S. C. Indul., 19 Jan., 1884, *Acta S. Sedis*, Vol. 17, page 402.
[13] S. C. Indul., 13 Nov., 1893, *Acta S. Sedis*, Vol. 26, page 310.

The prayers are to be said with a contrite heart, which means, according to a declaration of the S. Congregation of Indulgences,[14] that one not being in the state of grace must make a perfect act of contrition to be in the necessary disposition to gain any kind of an indulgence.

FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M.

Paterson, N. J.

FATHER MATHEW, APOSTLE OF TEMPERANCE.

BEFORE me lies an interesting volume, a biography of Father Theobald Mathew, ably written by John Francis Maguire, M.P., a contemporary and personal friend of Father Mathew. It was published by P. J. Kenedy of New York in 1898. It will well repay reading.

We have the drink problem in the United States to-day, but it may be safely affirmed that it is trivial compared with the evil wrought by drink a hundred years ago, aye, and later in the 'thirties and 'forties of the last century. Amongst us, the man who drinks freely loses caste; a hundred years ago, public men drank, and drank to excess, and nobody seemed to mind. Pitt, the greatest statesman in England in the last years of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth century, was fond of his bottle—he had been ordered by his doctor to drink port and well he fulfilled the precept—while the excesses of Fox, his talented opponent, are notorious. George IV, then Prince of Wales, drank freely. Members of Parliament, judges, lawyers, doctors, the nobility, everybody drank. It was a glory to be a "three-bottle man" when claret was the popular beverage. The history of Howe's army at Philadelphia during the Revolutionary War will occur to the reader's mind. "As drunk as a lord" dates from the period referred to, or earlier.

The habits of those who should have shown them better example had their effect on the lives of the common people. The gentry drank wine; ordinary people drank beer in England, and whiskey, which was then ridiculously cheap, in Ireland. The legitimate supply was even augmented by illicit

[14] *Decreta Authentica*, No. 427.

distilling. If the reader is familiar with Carleton's *Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry,* he will remember how prominently drink figures in its pages. And the biography of Father Mathew gives us an idea of the havoc wrought by drink at the time he began his campaign.

He who under God did more than anybody else to remedy this sad state of affairs was born in 1790 near Cashel in the County of Tipperary. A sweet, gentle boy he was, his mother's special favorite. This characteristic remained with him through life; everybody was attracted to him; nobody feared to speak to him. It was an invaluable help to him in his mission. He early manifested a vocation for the priesthood, and in 1807 he entered Maynooth. His stay there was brief. In 1808 he gave his friends a feast in his room, was caught in the act, and to save himself from expulsion voluntarily left the college.

So much the better, the reader will say. The ways of Providence are not ours. Had Theobald Mathew finished his course in Maynooth, been ordained for his native diocese, he would have gone through the usual career, holding a curacy or curacies for so many years, getting a parish when after long years of waiting his turn came. He might even have become Bishop of his diocese, and done great things for religion in his own appointed sphere. But confined by his position to local duties he could never have become Father Mathew, the Apostle of Temperance.

Having severed his connexion with Maynooth he joined the Capuchins in Dublin, and was ordained there in 1814 by the Archbishop, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray. All through life these two were fast friends, the beginning of their friendship having been made on that solemn day. The friendship of the able and saintly Dr. Murray was a thing not to be lightly esteemed.

Father Mathew's first appointment was to the Capuchin Friary at Kilkenny, but his stay there was brief. Cork and the Capuchin Friary in Cove Street are indelibly connected with his name. He went there as assistant to Father Donovan. What a history is connected with this name! Father Donovan, or Abbé Donovan as he was then known, was chaplain to a French nobleman when the Revolutionary storm

burst. His patron fled to England, thus saving his life. Abbé Donovan was left in charge of the mansion in Paris and its valuable contents. The Marquis was gone, but the Abbé was condemned to death in his stead. The morning came that was fixed for his execution. On rolled the tumbrils to the guillotine. In one of them was the Abbé Donovan, who had spent the previous night in preparing his fellow captives for death, and was now busy making his own preparation. The guillotine was reached and Abbé Donovan was about to step from the tumbril, when an officer rode up and cried out in Irish: "Are there any Irish among you?"—"There are seven of us," shouted Abbé Donovan. The officer, almost certainly one of the Irish Brigade, used his influence with the officials and guards, and had his countrymen put aside. He saved the lives of them all. Such was the history of the priest who was Father Mathew's superior. The two became fast friends.

Let us try to form an idea of the condition of the people among whom Father Mathew lived, labored, and secured such glorious results. The Penal Laws were still in force, not to be repealed till 1829. There was no public system of elementary education—that did not come till the 'thirties—and the majority of the common people could neither read nor write. They were poor, disqualified for public life by their very faith; they had the brand of inferiority on their brow. They drank, often to excess, cursed, swore, fought even, when under the influence of drink. But there was no immorality whatsoever connected with the drink traffic—public opinion would not stand that—nor gambling, nor robbery, nor violence, nor murder for money. The people were poor, and their lives were dull, so when they had a little money they drank, invariably in each other's company, out of good fellowship. That was all. If they fought when under the influence of drink, well, they fought a good fight, and bore no malice when it was over. Really there was a lot of the child about them, weakness and levity rather than downright wickedness. Their redeeming feature, the ground of hope for even the most fallen, was that they had the faith, and they had it strong, the faith begotten of two long centuries of bitter persecution. And, last but not least, they all, drunk or sober, had an extraordinary veneration, affection, and respect for a

priest, the heritage of the centuries when Irish students stole off to the Continent in trading boats, fishing smacks, and smuggling vessels, carrying with them a little money and a good knowledge of Greek and Latin, made their philosophical and theological studies in France, Spain, Italy, or Belgium, and came back as priests to minister to the people, carrying their lives in their hands. It should never be forgotten that in the bitter night of persecution the Irish priests never abandoned their flocks, nor were there ever wanting vocations to the priesthood. Especially during the first half of the eighteenth century Irish priests oftener than not had no churches, rarely had they a home. They lived in a wretched house, now with one Catholic family, now with another, as danger or necessity compelled a change of residence, but neither hardship, nor poverty, nor danger to life frightened them; they stuck to their people through thick and thin. And ever since, Irishmen stand by the priest.

There was no active persecution in Father Mathew's time. But the Catholics were cautious; they did not venture too far. Father Mathew, though a Capuchin, was clean-shaved. He never wore the religious habit in Ireland; more than likely never once in his life did he don the Capuchin's robe.

His life among the people was a quiet one, of hard, unobtrusive work. He was no pulpit orator, and as far as his spoken words were concerned, it was easy to criticize them adversely. But he was in downright earnest, and *he practised what he preached.* The following is Archdeacon O'Shea's estimate of him: [1]

> We have ourselves more than once gone to hear this preacher, with the express intent of duly and fairly estimating his powers as a speaker, and we have summoned to our aid as much of our critical bitterness as we conceived sufficient to preserve our judgment uninfluenced by the previous charm of his character. We were not listening to his affectionate, earnest, and pathetic exhortation more than ten minutes, when our criticism, our bitterness, our self-importance left us; all within us of unkind and harsh was softened down; our heart beat only to kindlier emotions; we sympathized with our fellow-Christians around us. We defy the sternness and severity of criticism to stand unmoved, though it may remain unawakened, while

[1] Life, pp. 67-68.

Mr. Mathew is preaching; and this is surely no mean criterion of the excellence of his character, and the efficiency of his ministry in the pulpit.

He has the advantage (though he appears to make little use of the advantage) of possessing a finely formed, middle-sized person, of exquisite symmetry; the head, of admirable contour, and from which a finished model of the antique could be cast; the countenance intelligent, animated, and benevolent; its complexion rather sallow, inclining to paleness; eyes of dark lustre, beaming with internal peace, and rich in concentrated sensibility, rather than speaking or kindling with a superabundant fire; the line of his mouth, harmonizing so completely with his nose and chin, is of peculiar grace; the brow, open, pale, broad, and polished, bears upon it the impress not merely of dignified thought, but of nobility itself.

His principal talent lies in the disposal of the persuasive topics. He is fond of appealing to the warm devotional feelings that have their fixed and natural seat in the Catholic bosom; to the devotional recollections and associations that alternately soothe and alarm the Catholic mind. To all these he appeals; matters so full of thrilling interest, and of inherent eloquence, that they burst on the soul with an all-subduing instantaneousness, and electric force, purifying and ennobling the commonest phraseology that happens to be selected as their vehicle. Thus has this excellent young man gone on, notwithstanding many imperfections, which may yet be removed by ordinary study and attention, preaching earnestly and successfully, and enforcing truth, and illustrating the beauty of the doctrine of his religion, by the noblest, the fairest, the most convincing comment—the undeviating rectitude, the unspotted purity, the extensive and indefatigable beneficence of his life. *O, si sic omnes!*

Mr. Maguire's estimate of Father Mathew as a preacher follows, and let it be borne in mind that Mr. Maguire knew him personally, and often heard him preach.[2]

Those who for the most part thronged to hear him, and crowded his little church with that object, were not inclined to be critical, or very capable of criticism. They came, in a humble spirit, to hear the Gospel expounded, to be told of the mercy and goodness of God, of the beauty and holiness of charity, by one whose life was the living example of the precepts he taught. What was it to them, if a simile were false, or a metaphor out of place, or an image occasionally tawdry, or a sentence wanting in polish, or a chain of reasoning

[2] Life, pp. 65-66.

loose and inconclusive? They crushed into that little temple to listen to the word of God preached by a man of God; and in that expectation they were never disappointed. Once within that church, they yielded themselves implicitly and unhesitatingly to his spiritual and moral guidance and they went with him whither he led them. Aye, and even those few who ordinarily could sit coldly in judgment upon the excellencies or the defects, the style or manner of a preacher, and who, perhaps, came just to see something of the young priest of whom the "common people" and the "old women" talked so much—even they, cool critics and lofty judges, as they held themselves to be, found themselves suddenly surprised by strange dimness of vision and a choking sensation in the throat, at the unpretending pathos of the preacher. What was the charm that held spellbound the close-packed hundreds beneath the pulpit, that riveted the attention of crowded galleries, and moved the inmost hearts even of those who had come to criticize? The earnestness of the preacher. Not the earnestness of the actor, who simulates, with cunning declamation and by impassioned gesture, the ardor of nature. No; it was the earnestness of truth, of sincerity, of belief. Father Mathew practised what he preached, and believed what he so persuasively and urgently enforced. Then, the emotion, which his voice made manifest to the ear, and which his agitated features made visible to the eye, was real, genuine, springing from the heart, thrilling his nerves, warming his blood, quickening his pulse—felt in every fibre of his frame. There was established between the preacher and the audience the most complete and perfect identity of feeling, the result of the sympathy which they mutually felt.

Father Mathew preached from the pulpit; he gathered the fruit in the confessional. The church was a small and poky one, the crowds large. Father Mathew sat in a miserably small box to hear his penitents, who came in their working clothes, bringing with them the odors that suggested their various occupations—some that of salt fish, others that of the butcher's shop or the sausage factory, and worst of all were the lamplighters whose duty it was to look after the fish oil in the street lamps. Certain mornings in the week Father Mathew sat and heard confessions from five to eight, or five to nine. As soon as the eight or nine o'clock Mass was over, and he had breakfast, he returned to the confessional. On Saturdays and the eves of holidays he sat as late as ten or eleven o'clock. Sometimes he put in fifteen hours a day hearing confessions. His penitents clung to him and brought

others. Finally his fame as a confessor was so well established that it spread into the next county, and people who came to market would not return home till they had gone to confession to Father Mathew.

In the course of his ministry Father Mathew had seen a great deal of the sin and misery caused by drink. Himself a total abstainer, he had no direct connexion with any temperance movement. There was a total abstinence association in Cork, the leading figures in which were the Rev. Nicholas Dunscombe, an Episcopalian, Richard Bowden, a Unitarian, and William Martin, better known as Billy Martin, a Quaker. Their success was very meagre. Their doctrine and practice were novel, nor had they the ear of the people. No wonder. They were all non-Catholics, and Catholic Emancipation was carried only in 1829. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.* Billy Martin was the brains of the movement. He knew Father Mathew, and was well aware of his influence with the people. We know how this influence was secured by Father Mathew's sermons, by his long hours in the confessional, by his blameless, holy life. Billy Martin would say in his Quakerish fashion: "O, Theobald Mathew, if thou would only give thy aid, much good could be done in this city." Father Mathew pondered and thought. No impulsive movement appealed to him. At length his mind was made up. At a meeting in the schoolroom he delivered a short address on the evils of drunkenness and the benefits of total abstinence. Then he came to the table, and taking the pen said in a voice heard by all: "Here goes in the name of God," and signed as follows: Rev. Theobald Mathew, C.C., Cove Street, No. 1. This was on the 10th of April, 1838.

It quickly became known that Father Mathew had signed the pledge. His example was immediately followed. Three months after he signed the pledge, he had 25,000 followers; in five months he had 131,000; and in less than nine months there were in Cork, 156,000 voluntary total abstainers. The pledge as administered by Father Mathew was for life. This start having been made in Cork, henceforth the movement was national.

Father Mathew traveled throughout Ireland to administer the pledge. He went either at the invitation of the bishop or

the local pastor. His first visit was to Limerick, whither he had been invited by the Bishop, the Most Rev. Dr. Ryan. He arrived there the first week in December, 1839. Even on the day before he was expected to arrive, the streets were thronged with people from all parts of the county, from the neighboring counties, and from the adjoining province. That week he administered the pledge to 150,000 people.

In 1842 he visited Glasgow at the invitation of the bishop. Glasgow papers are staid and sober as a rule, but they grew quite enthusiastic over Father Mathew. The first day of his visit he administered the pledge to 1,500, the second to 12,000. The third day the numbers were so immense that the count was lost, but from ten in the morning till six in the evening Father Mathew was busy administering the pledge to groups of people. From Glasgow he went to Edinburgh. In 1843 he visited London, taking in on his way Liverpool, Manchester, Salford, Huddersfield, Wakefield, and Leeds. In London alone he had 600,000 adherents. Archbishop Hughes invited him to New York, where he arrived in 1849. He administered the pledge in New York, Boston, Washington, Richmond, Wilmington, Savannah, New Orleans, and Little Rock. During his American tour his secretary kept a diary. One entry may be quoted, serving as it does to illustrate Father Mathew's method: [3]

> This will be a memorable day in Wilmington. Father Mathew, as usual, celebrated the holy sacrifice at half-past seven o'clock, lectured and administered the pledge; and at eleven o'clock preached—his text, "The Lord in His holy temple". The sermon universally applauded by all present. The little church was never filled so much before. Three-fourths were Dissenters, and many known to possess strong prejudices. All most orderly and respectful. Immediately after the sermon, spoke on temperance with much ability and force. His arguments, as usual, most conclusive, replete with spiritual quotations. The majority of the Catholic community, and several others, most respectable people, took the pledge. The Rev. Thomas Murphy and the boys on the altar were the first. The impression made by Father Mathew's sermon and discourses has had a most beneficial effect, especially with those of different opinions and strong prejudices. During the day he had some Americans, whose accession was

[3] Life, p. 488.

much applauded, and who acknowledged they would not take a pledge from any other individual.

Father Mathew died in 1856. To how many did he administer the pledge? No accurate figures are available. The number has been put as low as 2,000,000, and as high as 4,000,000. Three million seems a safe and conservative figure. The pledge was extraordinarily well kept. Men and women who had taken the pledge from Father Mathew were numerous in the 'seventies, fewer in the 'eighties, fewer still in the 'nineties. And the good work is still being done. Passing over local total abstinence societies, the Capuchins, Father Mathew's brothers in religion, have a flourishing total abstinence society in Church Street, Dublin, and they are invited by the bishops to preach and organize total abstinence in their dioceses. Gardner Street, Dublin, is the headquarters of the Pioneer Total Abstinence Society, the pledge of which is for life. You see its badge everywhere, in trains, in shops, and as you walk along the street. The Pioneer Pledge is remarkably well kept.

What were Father Mathew's methods? Personal example, direct appeal to the will of individuals or of groups. He never was a prohibitionist. Prohibition seems to be a purely American idea. What should be the attitude of priests toward it?

When a priest says, "Here goes in the name of God," and signs the pledge, he is on safe ground. So also, when he points out to his hearers the evils of drunkenness and invites them to become voluntary total abstainers. But when he appears on the prohibition platform, is he in the right surroundings? To me it is a matter of grave doubt. Prohibition oratory should not blind us priests to the following principles:

1. The moderate use of intoxicating drink is perfectly lawful.

2. Total abstinence is *de consilio* not *de precepto,* except in the case of him to whom on account of previous excesses drink even in moderation is the proximate occasion of sin.

3. What do our readers think of this view? It seems to me unlawful activity to engage in prohibitionist propaganda unless the man who chooses to drink in moderation is ac-

corded perfect liberty to get what he desires. Without this saving clause prohibition seems an unjust invasion of a man's personal liberty without due cause.

Frankly, the whole prohibitionist movement to me is suspect. It seems to savor of Manicheanism. When a Catholic paper has to answer an inquiry as to whether Mass is likely to be said in grape juice to avoid giving offence to the susceptibilities of non-Catholic prohibitionists, and when a minister, as at a recent Methodist Conference, proposes to censure President Wilson for putting wine on his table when he was entertaining, the average healthy-minded Catholic will pause. There is a flavor of arrogance and spiritual pride in the words and acts of those who constitute themselves leaders in the prohibitionist movement. The theory of the prohibitionists is shallow and erroneous. With them, it is the saloon and nothing else. It is not the saloon, it is the unbridled appetites of those who go to the saloon and drink to excess that are responsible for the drink evil. Father Mathew never attacked the saloon, or the saloon-keeper. By inducing the frequenters of the saloon to become voluntary total abstainers, he left the saloon empty, and the owner engaged in some other business. Another merited criticism of the prohibitionist movement is its total elimination of the supernatural. We all know its methods, meetings, speeches, whirlwind campaigns, elections. But there is not a word about prayer, about avoiding the occasions of sin, about seeking the help of the grace of God to overcome an evil habit that has been contracted. Voting the town dry will not take away a man's passion for strong drink. That means a personal effort, in which the individual needs the grace of God, and without which he will fail. Since prohibitionists have become politicians we hear the cry "A Saloonless Nation by 1920".

Prohibition? Or personal example, and voluntary total abstinence for our people? Which is the safer and sounder course for us priests?

VIATOR.

Analecta.

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV.

AD R. P. SERAPHINUM CIMINO, ORDINIS FRATRUM MINORUM MINISTRUM GENERALEM, SEPTIMO EXEUNTE SAECULO EX QUO INDULGENTIA PLENARIA DE PORTIUNCULA PRIMUM DIVINITUS DATA EST.

Dilecte Fili, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Ingravescente in dies hac mole communium miseriarum, quae Nos praecipue habent anxios et sollicitos, omnem equidem occasionem, quae nobis offeratur, arripimus propitiandae humano generi divinae maiestatis. Nam, cum miseros faciat populos peccatum, in hoc devenimus rerum discrimen, ut nisi vulgo homines paeniteat deliquisse ac paenitendo melioresque mores inducendo Dei benignitatem mundo concilient, nulla iam salutis spes reliqua videatur. Iam vero ad excitandum in bonis vel salutaris paenitentiae vel sanctioris vitae studium, opportune contingit ut illud propediem commemoretur tam praeclarum divinae indulgentiae munus, ante annos septingentos, beatissimo Francisco deprecante, tributum hominibus, quod a Portiuncula nominatur. Neque enim huius beneficii quisquam potest esse particeps, quin ante rite confitendo peccata expiaverit, omnemque omnino culpae amorem abiecerit. Accedit quod qui hanc lucrantur admissorum veniam, iis licet non sibi solum sed etiam pie defunctis in Christo eam lucrari: quibus

ipsa facultas rei saepius iterandae mirum quantum solatii potest afferre. Id quod, si unquam alias, est certe peropportunum hoc tempore, cum haec maximi belli immanitas multitudinem animarum, quae igni piaculari addictae sunt, innumerabilibus cotidie funeribus adauget. Itaque vehementer quidem cupimus ut toto orbe catholico ad sacras Franciscalium aedes vel ad eas quas sacrorum Antistites destinaverint, frequentior solito christianus populus, huius veniae impetrandae causa, confluat, sed ibi maxime id fiat ubi primum illa divinitus oblata est. Quamobrem statuimus ut integri anni spatio, id est a vesperis primi diei mensis augusti proximi ad occasum secundi diei mensis eiusdem consequentis anni, quisquis rite confessus et caelesti dape refectus Assisiatem Basilicam Sanctae Mariae ab Angelis adierit ibique pro Ecclesia ad mentem Summi Pontificis Deo supplicaverit, toties Plenariam Indulgentiam lucretur, quoties eam aedem inviserit. Atque ad amplificandam horum sollemnium dignitatem, iis Nosmet ipsi volumus per Legatum adesse; idque muneris dilecto Filio Nostro cardinali Philippo Giustini, quem Ordo Fratrum Minorum patronum habet, demandamus. Sperandum vero est fore ut compluribus ex omni ora ac parte terrarum natale solum Francisci atque incunabula institutorum eius adeuntibus, iterum illa sanctissimae vitae species ac forma valeat ad excitandum in hominibus studium christianae sapientiae et disciplinae, in primisque illius, quae hodie tantopere elanguit, fraternae caritatis. Caelestium autem bonorum auspicem et paternae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, tibi, dilecte Fili, et omnibus sodalibus tuis apostolicam benedictionem amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXIX mensis iunii MCMXVI, Pontificatus Nostri anno secundo.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DECRETUM OMAHENSIS ET KEARNEYENSIS MUTATIONIS FINIUM.

Cum Metropolitanus et Episcopi ecclesiasticae provinciae Dubuquensis, supplicem libellum ad Sanctam Sedem porrexissent ut a dioecesi Omahensi ad dioecesim Kearneyensem

transferantur comitatus civiles *Wheeler, Greeley, Howard* et ea pars comitatus *Hall* quae, a flumine *Platte* separata, versus septentrionem sita est, SSmus D. N. Benedictus XV, rebus omnibus mature perpensis, de consilio Emorum huius Sacrae Consistorialis Congregationis Patrum et suppleto, quatenus opus sit, interesse habentium consensu, annuens praefatis precibus, fidelium utilitati et Kearneyensis dioecesis incremento apprime cessuris, de plenitudine potestatis statuit ut praefati comitatus civiles *Wheeler, Greeley, Howard* et ea pars comitatus *Hall,* superius definita, a dioecesi Omahensi subtraherentur et ad dioecesim Kearneyensem assignarentur.

Statuit insuper Sanctitas Sua ut haec exsecutioni demandentur per R. P. D. Ioannem Bonzano, Archiepiscopum titularem Melitenensem et in Foederatis Statibus Americae Septentrionalis Delegatum Apostolicum, eidem tribuens necessarias et opportunas facultates, etiam subdelegandi, ad effectum de quo agitur, quamlibet personam in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutam, ac definitive pronuntiandi super quavis difficultate vel oppositione in exsecutionis actu oritura, facto praeterea ei onere ad hanc S. Congregationem intra sex menses exemplar mittendi, authentica forma exaratum, peractae exsecutionis.

Hisce denique super rebus eadem Sanctitas Sua praesens edi iussit consistoriale decretum: contrariis quibusvis minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 13 maii 1916.

✠ C. Card. De Lai, Episc. Sabinen., *Secretarius.*

L. * S.

✠ Thomas Boggiani, Archiep. Edessen., *Adsessor.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

I.

Dubia.

Rmi Episcopi Dioecesium Vizagapatamensis et Nagporensis, qui iam receperunt Kalendarium ad usum ipsarum Dioecesium a S. Rituum Congregatione revisum et approbatum, sequentia dubia pro opportuna solutione eidem S. Congregationi exposuerunt; nimirum:

I. An eiusmodi Kalendarium alhiberi possit ab omnibus sacerdotibus sive saecularibus sive religiosis suae Dioecesis?

II. An titulares Ecclesiarum Cathedralium et Patronus Indiarum debeant ab eisdem sacerdotibus omnibus celebrari cum octava, vel sine octava?

III. An Episcopi utriusque Dioecesis possint mutare titulares Ecclesiarum, sive quia incerti sunt, sive quia nec approbati, vel non habent Officium in Kalendario Dioecesano?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis voto, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. Servetur decretum de Festis localibus diei 28 februarii 1914 ad I et III.

Ad II. Serventur Rubricae novissimae ad normam Bullae *Divino afflatu*, Breviarii Romani, tit. IX, nn. 2° et 3°.

Ad III. Nihil innovetur, si agatur de Sanctis in Martyrologio Romano vel in eius Appendice approbata insertis. Si vero agatur de Ecclesiis consecratis et de titularibus incertis, proponatur elenchus antiquorum vel novorum titularium S. Rituum Congregationi pro approbatione. Quod si Ecclesia non fuerit consecrata aut solemniter benedicta, ipse Episcopus eam benedicat vel consecret, assignando Mysterium vel Sanctum Titularem iuxta Rubricas et Decreta; prae oculis habito, quod Beatis nec Ecclesiae, nec Altaria dedicari possunt.

Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit. Die 5 maii 1916.

✠ A. Card. Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae, *S. R. C. Pro-Praefectus.*

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*

II.

Dubia de Missa Votiva Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu et de Precibus post Missam.

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutio expostulata est:

I. An Missa Votiva Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, a Leone Papa XIII concessa pro qualibet Feria Sexta, quae prima in unoquoque mense occurrit, prohibita sit in omnibus Festis Domini, iuxta Decretum n. 3712 diei 28 iunii 1889; vel tantum in Festis Christi Domini, ad mentem novarum Rubricarum tit. IV, n. 7, tit. VI, n. 4 et iuxta Notanda in Tabellis n. 8?

II. An Preces post Missam omittere debeat Sacerdos, qui Sacrum facit in Oratorio cuiusdam Communitatis Religiosae, dum ipsa Communitas vel lectioni meditationis, vel alteri Missae assistit, vel ad recipiendam Sacram Communionem accedit, vel pias preces in communi recitat?

III. An liceat Preces omittere in fine Missae quae celebratur in altari Sanctissimi Sacramenti si immediate post eam Sacra Communio administranda sit?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, audito voto specialis Commissionis, respondendum censuit:

Ad I. *Negative* ad primam partem; *affirmative* ad secundam.

Ad II. *Negative;* et in casu Preces praescriptae recitentur submissa voce tam a Sacerdote celebrante quam a clerico seu inserviente vel tantum respondente; et dentur Decreta, praesertim Decretum de precibus in fine Missae recitandis diei 20 iunii 1913.

Ad III. *Negative* iuxta decretum suprarelatum, et in casu Ssma Eucharistia administretur post Preces.

Atque ita rescripsit ac declaravit, die 2 iunii 1916.

✠ A. Card. Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae, *S. R. C. Pro-Praefectus.*

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius.*

ROMAN CURIA.

Pontifical Appointments.

17 April, 1916: The Right Rev. Felix Ambrose Guerra, Titular Bishop of Hamatha, appointed Archbishop of Santiago, Cuba.

19 May, 1916: Monsignor Henry Daly, of the Archdiocese of Westminster, appointed Secret Chamberlain Supernumerary of the Pope.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman Documents for the month are:

POPE BENEDICT XV extends the Portiuncula Indulgence (on the occasion of the seventh centenary of its first institution) to all who visit the Portiuncula church at Assisi between 1 August (from first vespers), 1916 and 2 August (sundown), 1917.

S. CONGREGATION OF CONSISTORY by Decree 13 May, 1916, ordains a change in the limits of the dioceses of Omaha and Kearney, by transferring to the latter the counties Wheeler, Greeley, Howard, and that part of Hall county which lies north of the river Platte. All disputes arising out of this change are to be settled by the Apostolic Delegate.

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES answers (1) a doubt about the observance of a local calendar; and decides (2) that the prayers prescribed at the end of Mass are to be recited before distributing Holy Communion.

ROMAN CURIA gives official list of pontifical appointments.

DANGER IN GIVING OUT FICTION FOR RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

It never entered into the plans of Christ to reveal all at once the whole sum of religious truth to His disciples, or to acquaint them at any time with all the whys and wherefores of the truths which He thought it proper to reveal. He gave them as much as was good and sufficient for them, and put a veil over the rest. Had He done otherwise, there would be no such thing as divine faith. Whenever the Apostles itched to get information not intended for them, the Master never failed to administer a mild rebuke. Thus, to give a single instance, when they were curious to learn something anent the end of the world, He answered: "It is not for you to know the times and the moments which the Father has put—or kept—in His own power". That was one of God's secrets, and not for them to fathom.

What God saw fit to show us should be, and is, enough for us, and we ought to rest content with it and ask no more. The deposit of faith handed down through the Sacred Scriptures and authentic tradition is ample enough to serve the Creator's purposes, and it is ample enough to serve ours too. There is certainly no need to enlarge upon it and add to it. "The disciple is not above his master," and what sufficed for the Master must suffice for His disciples. If we attempt to go beyond that, and improve upon it, we run a serious risk of holding forth as the teachings of Christ the "doctrines and traditions of men", thereby putting ourselves in the same category with the ancient Pharisees.

All Catholic preachers and teachers admit this, of course, in theory, but all do not admit it in practice. And what I say of preachers and teachers applies more particularly to certain religious writers. A considerable quota of all three classes, not satisfied with the wide range of approved religious truth allowed them, persist in drawing on their imaginations for explanations and developments and details which have no basis of reality outside their own fancy. Growing weary of the monotony they experience on the regular and direct route, they stray off into the by-paths to seek for novelities and sensations. And being looked upon as safe guides by many of the injudicious or ill-instructed, they lead others away with them. Some of these never find their way back to the right road; and even those who do find it, have lost much valuable time in their journeying toward their destination.

What the motives of these fanciful preachers and teachers and writers may be, it is not ours to judge. While some of them are probably mere novelty-hunters trying to make an impression, or to win fame and popularity, by dishing-up the unusual, no doubt the majority are really sincere, thorough believers in their own home-made traditions and legends. They are simply following their peculiar bent of mind, and hope thereby to accomplish good. There is no need to impugn the motives of any of them. The point here is to show that, be their motives what they may, their methods are frequently hurtful to the religious faith and peace of mind of many of their hearers or readers. This is particularly true of the age in which we live. In the ages of faith the un-

founded speculations or fanciful legends of pious dreamers were not so baneful; but in the critical days in which our lines are cast, they are extremely dangerous.

First, as regards unbelievers. These, in nearly every case, are unable to distinguish between what Catholic books and sermons are approved by the Church, and what are merely the private opinions or baseless imaginings of individual Catholics; and of course it is but natural that such people should consider whatever they hear from a Catholic pulpit, or read in a Catholic book, as the genuine teaching of the Church. And when persons of discernment come across some of the "fish stories" served up to them by these imprudent preachers and writers, it is easy to forecast the result. They are likely to become disgusted with the whole sum and substance of Catholic doctrine and refuse to prosecute further the search for truth. And since they put these ultra-Catholic, unsanctioned notions on a par with our approved teachings—and that without any fault of theirs—we cannot blame them.

Again, in so far as Catholics themselves are concerned. The fact that we, all of us, have been most liberally dosed with these pious legends in our childhood and youth, and yet managed to recover, is a proof that they are not seriously detrimental to well-instructed or well-balanced people who have sense and judgment enough to separate the wheat from the chaff. But, unfortunately, there are legions of Catholics whose religious instruction never goes beyond the elementary stage, who are not thoroughly grounded in the principles and teachings of their Church, who know little beyond what they were taught as children; and to such as these the class of books and sermons to which I refer may prove very damaging in their maturer years. When they come to the age of discretion they must realize that a not inconsiderable portion of the religious pabulum on which their childish minds were fed is purely fanciful, without any foundation in fact; and, if they lack the saving grace of judgment, they are apt to put all in the same category—the true with the false or uncertain, the wheat with the chaff—and throw them all overboard.

I take it for granted that there is no need to specify here, that the reader knows what the writer is driving at. We cannot afford to mention by name any of the books or sermons to

which we refer. They must be familiar to most readers. Many of us have heard descriptions of hell, for instance, which almost forced us to the conclusion that the preacher had been there on a tour of inspection, had made a thorough study of all its machinery, and was perfectly acquainted with its every nook and cranny. They describe its temperature to the smallest fraction of a degree, the special kinds of torments designed for special kinds of sin, the appearance of the place, or state, and its inhabitants, etc. A convent-school graduate once told the present writer that she was puzzled as a child over the possibility of getting her into one of the small boxes (one foot by six inches) which the good Sister described as the abodes of the damned. And she added that she is still more puzzled now that she has taken on more than a hundred pounds since her school days. Now what, in the name of common sense, is the use of filling children's heads, or the heads of adults either, with such nonsense? Isn't hell bad enough as it is, or as it is known to us from Scripture, without drawing on our imagination for all these lurid, hobgoblin pictures? If we confine ourselves to what is of faith, or at least to what has the approval of authentic tradition, we shall have more than enough to produce the desired impression on our hearers. The fanciful details will serve only to disgust many who realize that they are but fancies; and, if the hearers are ill-balanced, they may be led to doubt the doctrine altogether.

Of course the man who would undertake to do away entirely with the legendary in religion would be undertaking an altogether hopeless task, an impossible task. There is a natural tendency to the legendary inborn in the human race. We find it all through history, secular as well as sacred. Every historical student is aware that the largest portion of ancient profane history is of this character—legendary or mythical. How much of the so-called history of Ulysses and Hector, of Æneas and Romulus and Remus, etc., is true, and how much mythical? And there is no need to go back to the heroes of antiquity to prove this point. Have not myths grown up even round the name of such a comparatively recent celebrity as our own George Washington? Men are naturally prone to weave myths and romances about the names

and memories of their national heroes, particularly their progenitors, the founders of their race or family.

And they carry that same tendency with them into their religious faith. Witness the old pagan mythology. No nation is exempt from it. And so it has flourished to a certain extent in the Christian religion itself. Even in the first age of the Church apocryphal gospels abounded—pure products of the imagination in most cases, purporting to give details of the lives and doings of the Master and His Blessed Mother and His Apostles. And the self-same tendency has been in operation in every age of the Church's history; men and women drawing on their fancy to improve on the apocryphal gospels, and to magnify the name and fame of their favorite or patron saints by attributing to them unauthenticated wonders. The writer trusts it is not necessary to state that there is no intention of reflecting on the well-attested miracles of the saints—those recognized by the Church—but only on those which have had their origin in the fancy of the enthusiast.

Assuredly the less of this ultra-Catholic stuff we have, the better for the rank and file of the faithful, and the better the outlook for the conversion of non-Catholics. And while we cannot expect to eradicate entirely this itching tendency for the legendary, for groundless marvels and fanciful picturings, it will be by no means a loss of time or energy to try to lessen the output. As we said before—and it can't be stated too often or too strongly—we have enough, and more than enough, to appeal to the hearts and minds of the intelligent, in the duly approved and tried and tested traditions of the Church, without drawing on the imagination for extra supplies.

The truth, and nothing but the truth, must be our motto, if we mean to hold the people of this and succeeding generations. I omit "the *whole* truth" purposely, because there are many whom, on account of their ignorance or unsophisticatedness, the *whole* truth might hurt instead of benefiting. As Cardinal Newman has pointed out, in several of his works, the principle of the "economy" has been in use in the Church almost from its inception. We have seen that Christ Himself used it, and the Father before Him. Thus the Almighty is said to have "winked at the times of ignorance among the

heathen", and He permitted divorce to the Jews "because of the hardness of their hearts". Joseph "made himself strange to his brethren"; Elisha kept silence on request of Naaman to bow in the temple of Rimmon; St. Paul circumcized Timothy while protesting that "circumcision availeth not".

"The principle of the Economy is this", writes Newman, "that out of various courses in religious conduct or statement, all and each allowable antecedently and in themselves, that ought to be taken which is most expedient and most suitable at the time for the object in hand." As the present writer remarked in the beginning of this paper, "Almighty God did not all at once introduce the Gospel to the world, but gradually prepared men for its profitable reception; so, according to the doctrine of the early Church, it was a duty for the sake of the heathen among whom they lived, to observe a great reserve and caution in communicating to them the knowledge of 'the whole counsel of God'. This cautious dispensation of the truth, after the manner of a discreet and vigilant steward, is denoted by the word 'economy'. It is a mode of acting which comes under the head of Prudence, one of the four Cardinal Virtues."

It is evident, from Cardinal Newman's words, that the economy refers to moral conduct as well as to dogmatic teaching; and Newman himself emphasizes this in the following observation: "I have shown above that the doctrine in question had in the early Church a large signification when applied to the divine ordinances; it also had a definite application to the duties of Christians, whether clergy or laity, in preaching, in instructing or catechizing, or in ordinary intercourse with the world around them." All of us can recall numerous instances in which it would have been the height of imprudence to give out the whole truth to the immature, the ill-instructed, or the ill-balanced, for the simple reason that they would be likely to abuse their new-found knowledge, to become full-fledged casuists in their own cases, to trifle with moral law, to go the limit, or even beyond the limit—their only aim being to stay on the hither side of mortal sin. These are instances, certainly, to which applies the old saw, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise".

Strict adherence to moral principle, and not casuistry, is what these people need. If you inform them, for example, that the theft of a certain amount is but a venial offence, that ordinarily casuists hold it requires five, or eight, or ten dollars to constitute a mortal sin, many of them will have little scruple in appropriating the amount within the limit of grievous sin. And so with many other instances that might be mentioned.

However, there is such a thing as carrying the "economy" itself to excess; and the one extreme is apt to prove as detrimental as the other. Writing on this subject, Cardinal Newman remarks: "It may be said that this principle, true in itself, yet is dangerous because it admits of an easy abuse, and carries men away into what becomes insincerity and cunning. This is undeniable; to do evil that good may come, to consider that the means, whatever they are, justify the end, to sacrifice truth to expedience, unscrupulousness, recklessness, are grave offences. . . . The abuse of the 'economy' in the hands of unscrupulous reasoners is obvious. Even the *honest* controversialist or preacher will find it very difficult to represent, without *misrepresenting,* what it is yet his duty to present to his hearers with caution or reserve. Here the obvious rule to guide our practice is to be careful ever to maintain *substantial* truth in our use of the economical method. And so far from concurring at all hazards with Justin, Gregory, or Athanasius, I say it is plain they were justified or not in their economy, according as they did or did not mislead practically their opponents. It is so difficult to hit the mark in these perplexing cases that it is not wonderful should these or other Fathers have failed at times, and said more or less than was proper." And he ends his remarks on the matter by casting a very serious doubt on the general expediency of the economy in our own day and generation, at least so far as his own country is concerned. "As to the Catholic religion in England at the present day, this only will I observe —that the truest expedience is to answer right out when you are asked; that the wisest economy is to have no management; that the best prudence is not to be a coward; that the most damaging folly is to be found out shuffling; and that the first of virtues is to 'tell truth and shame the devil'."

It will be seen from all this that the proper use of the economy is an extremely delicate matter, one requiring no ordinary degree of judgment, since even the Fathers sometimes fell into error in applying it. What Newman says of the Church in England, applies with equal force to our own country, conditions being practically the same. Unless there is a manifest reason for using the economy, for concealing part of the truth; unless there is a real necessity, or a real utility in sight, it is decidedly the part of discretion to tell the truth, without any shifting or evasion; for, as Newman says, should we be subsequently found out in what our hearers will likely consider a downright lie, it will prove the most damaging folly of all; they will lose all confidence in our guidance.

While the telling of the whole truth to those who are unable or unwilling to make a right use of it, who might even abuse it, may be, in some circumstances, highly indiscreet, rather harmful than beneficial, the other extreme, the deliberate perversion of the truth, would prove a far more serious blunder. When an inquirer asks outright whether an act or an omission is sinful or not, mortally or venially sinful, he is entitled to a truthful answer. The reply should, of course, be accompanied by explanations calculated to guard the questioner against misconception or abuse; but give the truth at all events. Otherwise the questioner is forced to one of two conclusions: either that you do not know the truth of the matter, or that you are deliberately trying to keep him in ignorance—either of which conclusions is equally fatal to the confidence he had in you.

I am aware that theologians commonly hold to the opinion that where people are inculpably ignorant of the grievousness of an offence which, in all likelihood, they would keep on committing even if they knew the truth, it is better, in certain cases, to leave them in their ignorance. It is a matter of balancing the good and the evil likely to result from a concealment of the truth. But, even admitting the validity of this balancing theory, is it not true, on the other hand, that many who are committing acts subjectively venial but objectively grave, through ignorance, would strive to rid themselves of their bad habits if they once knew the truth? Again

it might be argued that those who are so ill-disposed that they would continue in their course even with the knowledge that it is gravely sinful, are not so very innocent after all; and the wisdom of sacrificing the interests of truth for their sake is rather doubtful; there is not much of a gain to justify the risk. Better far to tell the truth and take the consequences; it will prove the safer course in the long run.

Every confessor knows of the multitudes of subjective mortal sins committed daily owing to this concealment of the truth—sometimes to positive acts of something very close to downright untruth—by teachers and preachers. Words and thoughts and omissions which are at most but venially sinful —at times not even *venially* sinful—are magnified by the ill-instructed or timorous into grave sins; and not rarely some of these peccadilloes are among the most common of human failings, failings which it is almost morally impossible to avoid altogether. Even on the balancing of good and evil theory, is it wise to permit this condition? Would it not be far more *politic,* as well as far more moral, to tell the truth? It would require more work, in the way of explanation, from religious teachers—higher motives of morality than the mere steering clear of mortal sin; the grievousness of *any* sin, no matter how apparently trifling; the dangers of trifling—"qui spernit modica, paulatim decidet", etc.; but would it not be well worth while? Should not the interests of the ninety-nine be looked after as well as those of the one who has gone astray?

Does it make for moral betterment to leave our people under the impression that "damn" is a mortal sin, or even a venial sin? Or that the telling of an officious lie, or a jesting lie, or the theft of a few pennies, is grievously sinful? Do not these misunderstandings simply increase the number of subjective mortal sins? And, taken all in all, which side of the scales is the weightier, the good or the evil? Even the most innocent and inoffensive actions are frequently construed as sinful by young folks who have been misled by their well-meaning but thoroughly indiscreet teachers. To give what is perhaps an extreme instance: the present writer has heard young women accuse themselves of whistling as something seriously immoral, and that because their pious teachers

taught them that " when a girl whistles, she makes the Blessed Mother weep ". Probably many of those who read these lines have had the same or similar cases to deal with.

And what I say of the moral side of religion holds equally true of dogmatic and historical instruction. Where the doctrine of the Church is clear and explicit on points of faith, needless to observe, it should be given as the Church gives it, without let or stint, no matter how strange or improbable it may appear at first blush to the hearers; and no matter how unpalatable it may be to them. But there is not very much to be feared from this quarter, unless in the case of a number so small as to be practically negligible—those who are either materially or formally heretics. The overwhelming majority will never mince matters when the faith is at stake.

It is in matters which are open and free to discussion that the real danger lies; particularly in unauthenticated " traditions ". As I remarked above, there are some minds so constituted that they have a natural bent to the marvelous, the unusual. They need not to be egged on but rather to be held in check. Every people under the sun has its myths, both in sacred and secular, or profane, history. Who started them, as a rule we know not. Probably natural-born poets who came gradually to regard their poetic images as real facts. Far be it from the present writer to presume to accuse any single one of them of deliberate dishonesty. It is a peculiar psychological phenomenon, but it is a psychological fact nevertheless, that some people do come in time to look upon their dreams and wishes as living realities; their notions of what *ought* to be, or what they *think* ought to be, as really having been. And there are not wanting multitudes of a like mind or temperament to believe unhesitatingly the fictions these people give out as truth.

For example, there are the innumerable legends concerning the favorite saints of various nations; legends ofttimes as childish as the fairy tales we tell our children, and every whit as improbable and incredible as the fabulous tales of the old pagan mythology. And there are others less improbable and more plausible, pious fictions which we were taught in our childhood, and which we would all like to hold on to, but, unfortunately, cannot. For instance, many of the ele-

vating incidents recorded in the apocryphal gospels; the Apostolical Constitutions, and particularly that beautiful legend anent the Apostles' Creed—to wit: that, before setting forth to convert the world, the twelve Apostles assembled together and composed each, in order of dignity, one after another of the twelve articles—and that by divine inspiration. It is beautiful, and it seems quite plausible, and we would all dearly love to believe it; but, unfortunately, the facts are against it; it is not so. And better far the truth, howsoever bitter, or rudely awakening, than pleasing fiction. Do not tell the children these things, these poetic imaginings; or, if you do, tell them as they are. Give them their real value, or lack of value. If you do not, there is a very serious danger that many of these children when they grow up and find that they have been deceived in minor matters—and not having sense or discernment enough to distinguish between matters of *minor* and matters of *major* importance, or to give matters which are strictly of faith and those which are free their relative importance—may come to believe that they have been deceived in many more, perhaps all, of the Church's teachings. This is not likely to be the fate of the normal Catholic, reared in a thoroughly Catholic atmosphere, and whose environment and associates continue Catholic long after his school days are past and gone. But unfortunately the lines of all who have passed through our schools are not cast in such pleasant places. Many of them never add an iota to the religious instruction they received at school, and upon leaving it are thrown into bitterly anti-Catholic surroundings. And if they once come to realize, or have the realization thrust upon them by others, that much of what they were taught does not rise above the level of fairy tales or fish stories, what is likely to be the result? It is for these latter that we fear, and it is principally for their sakes that we would like to call a halt on the teaching of what is pleasing enough, but untrue or highly improbable, and have religious guides stick to the known truth, or at least to verisimilitude.

We do not belong to the people who would take all the poetry out of the child's life; who would do away with Santa Claus, and Red Riding-Hood, and Cinderella. If we had the training of children, we would not adopt the methods of

Dickens's Mr. Gradgrind. On the contrary, personally we incline to the poetic and the romantic in the training of children. And probably, so far as secular history is concerned, it may do no great harm. But, as we have tried to point out, when the faith is in question, there is entirely too much at stake to take any chances. In this connexion we may well apply to faith what the poet Burns says of honor:

> But where ye feel your faith grip,
> Let that aye be the border.

JOHN E. GRAHAM.

Baltimore, Maryland.

THE PRIMARY EFFECT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

By the primary effect of a sacrament we understand that effect which was chiefly intended by its author, or, that effect which constitutes the adequate reason of its institution. Secondary effects are such as are concomitant with the primary effect. These are but remotely intended by the author. No sacrament could be instituted for secondary effects only.

What is the primary effect of Extreme Unction? In other words, why did Christ institute this sacrament?

To our catechisms treating this sacrament we might well apply the words of Clericatus[1] regarding certain modern theologians: "Modernos sc. theologos ita confuse loqui de effectibus hujus sacramenti, ut nullibi reperiatur apud ipsos clara et concors doctrina, quae studiosorum animum instruat, at, e contra potius non leves difficultates gignat ac dubia irresoluta relinquat." Certainly our catechisms are singularly defective in the treatment of Extreme Unction.

The catechism used in our diocese, Faerber's, gives the following answer to the question, What benefits does Extreme Unction confer upon the soul?: 1. It increases sanctifying grace; 2. it remits the venial sins and such mortal sins as the patient cannot confess; 3. it gives strength in suffering and temptations.

It is evident that such an answer is altogether unsatisfactory; indeed, it is presumptuous to foist such an answer

[1] *Decisiones sacramentales*, dec. 82, n. 1.

upon an intelligent student. None of the three effects adduced can in any manner be considered a primary effect, a reason why a special sacrament should be instituted. The first is a common effect of all the sacraments of the living, as well as of every good work performed in the state of grace. The second is the effect intended primarily by Penance, and becomes only accidentally the effect of Extreme Unction. The third is an immediate effect of Holy Communion.

The No. 2 Catechism of the Third Council of Baltimore gives a more theological answer, stating the effects of Extreme Unction thus: 1. to comfort us in the pains of sickness and to strengthen us against temptations; 2. to remit venial sins and to cleanse our soul from the remains of sin; 3. to restore us to health if God sees fit.

Here again, the first effect is a secondary one, which also is obtained in Holy Communion. The third is evidently not the primary effect. As to the second, so far as sin is concerned (and here it should have been added that also those mortal sins are remitted which the patient cannot confess), it is obvious again that Extreme Unction only *per accidens* remits sin, Penance having this as its primary purpose. There remains then the effect "of cleansing our soul from the remains of sin". There follows immediately the question, "Which are the remains of sin?" It is answered thus: "By the remains of sin I mean the inclination to evil and the weakness of the will which are the result of our sins and which remain after our sins have been forgiven."

This answer is, to say the very least, altogether inadequate. That Extreme Unction strengthens the will and diminishes inclination to evil is true, but these things are by no means all the "remains" of sin, nor nearly the most consequential remains. By the "remains" of sin we must understand anything and everything that still in any manner finds the soul imperfect in the sight of God. The effect of Extreme Unction therefore, its primary effect, that effect which our Lord intended by its institution is this: *to effectively prepare our soul for immediate transfer from earth to heaven.*

Extreme Unction, if properly received, intends to eliminate purgatory for the recipient, intends to guarantee him the immediate beatific vision after death. The purpose of this

article is to prove this thesis, or at least to allege sufficient evidence so as to interest such priests as may read this, in the study of this question. If they look into it seriously, they will derive untold consolation from their effort, both for themselves and for those confided to their charge.

The Rev. Joseph Kern, S.J., tells us in the prologue of his book *Tractatus de Extrema Unctione*,[2] that he found considerable surprise expressed, both on the part of the clergy and the laity, when they first heard that the principal effect of Extreme Unction was to bring the soul immediately into heaven after death. "I confess," he continues, "I myself was dumfounded, when, studying the works of the great doctors of the thirteenth century, I discovered that they taught that the proximate effect of Extreme Unction consisted in that perfect health of the soul which disposed it to the immediate beatific vision, unless restoration of bodily health were more expedient."

There can be no doubt that, because of controversies with Protestantism and Jansenism, certain Catholic doctrines and beliefs have at times been either emphasized or put into the background. Thus, for example, the practice of less frequent Communion was brought about by Jansenism. Thanks to Pius X, the ancient custom is now restored. Similarly, the Catholic doctrine on purgatory was emphasized in the Church because of Protestant attacks on this belief. This may have resulted in neglecting to emphasize sufficiently the doctrine regarding the effect of Extreme Unction. At any rate this beautiful and consoling teaching seems to have been somewhat neglected during the past centuries. Let us hope that the ancient belief will be speedily revived.

Reason seems to demand the justice of our contention, regarding the effect of Extreme Unction. When still a boy in school, I sometimes heard of people being baptized on their deathbed. I used to envy them, and wished I could be baptized on my deathbed too, as then all fear of hell and purgatory would be done away with. Here is the point: Why should a heathen, who, perhaps, has led a bad life and is baptized on his deathbed, go straight to heaven, and a Catholic

[2] Pustet, 1907.

who, habitually at least, has led a good life, still have to face purgatory or even be afraid of hell? That certainly does not seem reasonable. One might say that the advantage of the Catholic lay in the fact that, owing to his good works, he would get a higher place in heaven. But this would not solve our problem at all. That we have merits is due to our personal achievements. We are dealing here with sin and punishment, and so far as these are concerned the heathen baptized in the end has a decided advantage, unless we have a means that will rid us of sin and punishment as effectively and as easily as Baptism frees him. Certainly there can be no reason why Christ should not have given us such a means. On the contrary, it would seem eminently in harmony with His divine love to provide us exactly with just such a means. The hour of separation between soul and body is the most important hour in our existence. Eternity depends upon it. Christ has instituted sacraments for other, less important steps that we take in life. These sacraments, as far as lies within them, are absolutely adequate in enabling us to face perfectly the situation that will confront us after the reception of the respective sacrament. The situation we have to face after death is judgment by God. Extreme Unction is to prepare us for this, that is admitted. Must it not therefore prepare us adequately for it? And no preparation that left even the slightest difficulty between the soul and its Judge could be called adequate. Nor will it do to lay too much stress on the preparation that is required on the part of the one receiving the sacrament. His part is no more than to remove the *obices*, and then the sacrament will infallibly, out of its own inherent efficiency, produce the full effect. No greater effort can be required on the part of the recipient than would be required, for instance, in the reception of Baptism.

The above argument might also be put in this way: Holy Scripture tells us: "He loved those that were His own, and He loved them to the end." This love of our Lord could never be content with liberating our souls from sin and hell. This love of the Good Shepherd necessarily had to induce Him to provide for His beloved sheep some means of doing away with all the remnants of sin, all punishments; induce Him to institute a sacrament that would so dispose the soul

that, immediately after leaving this mortal body, it could fly into the arms of its Creator. Or was that love exhausted when it had freed us from hell? Was it not great enough to provide also a remedy against the dreads of purgatory? Certainly it was, and, in instituting Extreme Unction, our Lord gave us that remedy. As the great Suarez says: "This sacrament, if it meets no obstacle, takes away every ill from the soul that might in any way impede or retard its entrance to eternal glory. This is the kind of preparation we need for our end. It is most becoming that there be a sacrament to procure this grace for us, and since no other sacrament has been instituted for it, it is evident that this [Extreme Unction] is that sacrament." [3]

It does seem self-evident that one should have a means of so disposing oneself for death that entrance into heaven becomes immediate. Nor is there any reason to suppose why such a disposition should be particularly difficult to obtain. In the sacrament of Penance, ordinarily not all punishments are remitted. The Council of Trent (XIV Sess.) tells us that Penance will cleanse us perfectly only if accompanied "magnis fletibus et laboribus". This sacrament is therefore not available for our purpose. One might say that we have the plenary indulgence and the apostolic benediction. I answer that these depend too much upon the disposition, the piety and exertion of the patient. A plenary indulgence presupposes remission of all sins, and in so trying a need it is altogether too uncertain a thing. We must have a sacrament; nothing less will do.

From the writings of many of the Fathers of the Church it is apparent that they took for granted the doctrine that Extreme Unction prepares the soul for the immediate beatific vision. They indicate this view so plainly, that their sayings served as a basis for the scholastic theologians in their contention that this belief is well founded upon the tradition of the Church.

St. John Chrysostom, for instance, in extolling the power of the priesthood in forgiving sins mentions only Baptism and Extreme Unction. It cannot be explained why he should

[3] De Sacr. Poenit. et Ext. Unct. disp. 41, sec. 1, n. 44. We give the sense rather than a literal translation.

leave out Penance, except that, as was in harmony with his purpose, he alluded only to those sacraments that completely and perfectly wiped out all sin and all punishment, restoring complete harmony with God.[4]

Considering the most ancient formulas that were used in consecrating the "oleum infirmorum" we must come to the conclusion that its efficacy was looked upon in the light of our contention. Thus it was called a "Chrisma Dei perfecta", a "dispeller of every evil", a "medicine of life and salvation", a "perfecta confortatio corporis, animae et spiritus".

The prayers that were used in administering this sacrament from the eighth century to the eleventh ask for the "immediate mercy of God, so that by virtue of the sacrament the patient might immediately be transferred to eternal glory." Those who read even a few of these prayers, says Professor Kern, cannot but come to the conclusion that this sacrament will restore the same purity and innocence to the recipient that the sacrament of Baptism would bestow. Here is a sample: "Impleat te dominus Spiritu Sancto. Ipse dominus per omnia sanctificet te ad prefectum, ut integer spiritus tuus et anima et corpus sine querela in adventu Christi servetur." [5]

St. Egbert, Archbishop of York in the eighth century, tells us: "It is written that the soul of the one who has received this rite [Extreme Unction] is equally as pure as the soul of a child that dies immediately after Baptism." [6]

Dogmatic theology instructs us to have great regard for the teachings of the scholastics, in cases where Scripture or the Fathers are not sufficiently explicit on a subject, and that their weight is all the greater if they are universally in accord regarding a particular case. As for Extreme Unction, these great doctors teach without a dissenting voice that it is an undoubted truth that this sacrament is instituted for the purpose of disposing the soul of the dying for its immediate transfer to heaven. Let us adduce but a few testimonies. B. Albertus Magnus [7] tells us: "Extreme Unction effects the complete purification of soul and body by removing every ob-

[4] De Sacerdotio, I, III, n. 5.
[5] Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, t. I, p. 865.
[6] *Poenitentialis Liber*, I, c. 15.
[7] In IV, dis. II. a. 1.

stacle of glory to either part of man." Again he says: Extreme Unction, because it removes all remains (of sin) "valet ad immediatam evolutionem". In another place: "To remove the remains of sin in so far as these obstruct the immediate flight of the soul (to heaven) and the glorification of the body is the 'effectus substantialis' of this sacrament."

St. Bonaventure [8] says that in regard to Extreme Unction, this in substance must be held, that it is the sacrament of those departing from life, preparing and disposing them "ad sanitatem perfectam", and what he understands by this perfect health he explains "quae quidem est gloriae".

St. Thomas,[9] in speaking of this sacrament, says: "Hoc sacramentum immediate disponit hominem ad gloriam"; and he goes on to state that it was not prefigured in the Old Law for the simple reason that then nothing like it could be had, as it was not possible for anyone immediately to enter heaven, which was opened only by the coming of Christ. In his *Summa* the Angelic Doctor did not get to the point of treating this sacrament specifically; death prevented him. However, in III p., qu. 65, speaking of the number of sacraments, he has this to say: "Since man sometimes incurs physical as well as spiritual infirmity, namely, sin, therefore it is necessary that he be cured of his disease. This cure is twofold. One effect of it is that which heals the infirmity, restoring health, and this, in spiritual life is effected by Penance. The other is the restitution to the former strength ('valetudinis pristinae'), and this is effected by Extreme Unction, which removes all remains of sin and prepares a man for final glory." In III p., qu. 84, a. 1, ad 1 of the *Summa* we read that in Extreme Unction "perfecta sanitas spiritualis" is conferred. It is clear that anything in the soul that could retard its entrance to heaven is incompatible with this "perfect health".

Again, some one may be inclined to say that the sacrament in question inherently possessed the qualities that we contend for, but that its full effect depended upon the exceeding good disposition on the part of the recipient. We repeat that

[8] Breviloquium, Pars VI. c. 11.

[9] Suppl. qu. 29. a. 1.

too much stress cannot be laid upon the part that the patient plays. All he has to do is to remove the *obices,* and in this case that will mean no more than mere attrition, no more than would be required in Baptism. The very difference in the grace bestowed through a sacrament and through other good works comes from this, that in the latter case the grace depends upon the person principally, and in the former upon the sacrament principally. In Extreme Unction the *essential* purpose is the *perfect health* of the soul, not more or less perfect health. If it were the latter, then the effect would indeed depend upon the disposition of the recipient, but since it is the former, *perfect* health, the degree of disposition does not come into question at all, any proper disposition will suffice to get the *entire* benefit of the sacrament. In his *Summa contra Gentiles,* I, IV, c. 73, St. Thomas goes so far as to state that this sacrament is for the very purpose of procuring the immediate beatific vision just for those who, because of negligence, shortness of time, or similar deficiencies, do not sufficiently care for themselves. The sacrament makes up for the very shortcomings of the recipient; that is one of its purposes. It helps us almost in spite of ourselves.

Peter of Tarantasia, who later became Pope Innocent V, in his qu. II, a. 2, states as follows: "The effect of Extreme Unction is twofold—the health of the soul and the health of the body, which also typifies spiritual health. But not any kind of spiritual health must be understood—but that final and perfect health which disposes for immediate eternal glory."

Aureolus, called "Princeps Scotistarum", enumerating seven effects of Extreme Unction, says: "As under the sign of Baptism man enters the militant church, so under the sign of the sacrament of Extreme Unction he enters the triumphant church."

Petrus a Palude concludes his treatise on Extreme Unction thus: "That militant man be finally victorious, and victorious be cleansed so that he may enter heaven without further purgation—for these two reasons are we anointed."

Our doctrine can be easily inferred also from the pronouncements of the Council of Trent, speaking on this subject in the fourteenth session. We learn that Extreme Unc-

tion is the complement of Penance; that in the latter complete justification is obtained only with great difficulty, but that Extreme Unction supplies what Penance lacks, effacing all that remains of sin even after confession. But I think I may safely conclude this article at this stage. I have brought sufficient evidence, it seems to me, that every priest can feel safe in preaching from pulpit and instructing the children in this sense: "If you, on your deathbed receive the sacrament of Extreme Unction, you will in all probability not have to go to purgatory, but you will be cleansed by the anointment just as though you were newly baptized."

If this contention is correct—and who can doubt it?—then the priest who fails so to instruct his flock is most cruelly robbing them of one of the chief consolations of our holy Faith.

F. TECKLENBURG.

Mound City, Ill.

COMMENT.

Through the Editor's courtesy I have read the above argument by Father Tecklenburg, and venture to offer a comment; not as a theological controversialist but in the interest of sound and careful catechetics for which he pleads.

It may be readily admitted that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction *prepares* the soul of the rightly disposed recipient for the immediate enjoyment of the Beatific Vision—so far as the remission of sin and guilt is concerned. But it does not seem to follow from this that the soul thus relieved of sin and guilt is actually fitted for the enjoyment of heaven, as he concludes. The enjoyment of the Beatific Vision demands more than freedom from sin or its guilt. There is need also, besides this negative disposition, of a positive direction of the habits of the soul to God as the only object worthy of our love. The habits of the soul are fashioned by man's mode of living on earth. They may bend in the direction of natural enjoyments even while the soul by an act of the will rightly guided and by the special sacramental grace of Extreme Unction turns to God and is relieved of the burden of sin and its penalty. Let me try to explain in a popular way.

The function of purgatory is not merely penitential; it is by implication also medicinal and corrective. A soul entering

it is in the condition of a child that has strayed from home and acquired certain bad habits. The offences arising out of these habits may be readily forgiven on its return home, and the child may be completely restored to the affections of the parental circle, but it will have to undergo a certain discipline eliminating the old habits, and it will have to acquire new ones before it can take its place in a company where good manners are demanded.

Father Tecklenburg adduces a comparison between the Catholic receiving Extreme Unction and an infidel receiving Baptism on his deathbed, inferring that the former sacrament must do more than the latter to satisfy the sense of justice. Apart from any argument as to the relative value and effect of the two sacraments in the given cases, it seems to me that the comparison would equally forcibly apply to two Catholics one of whom is habitually fervent and one who has been negligent, both of whom receive Extreme Unction in proper disposition. What the Fathers and scholastics really say is that Extreme Unction disposes the recipient for the immediate Beatific Vision; but this disposition creates only a condition which immediately assures him of the remission of sin and guilt, not necessarily fitting the soul for the immediate enjoyment of God's presence. CATECHIST.

THE PRIEST AND THE AUTOMOBILE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

A Catholic traveling man in my parish whose business brings him in contact with a great many Catholic priests in all parts of the country tells me he has observed within the last few years a phenomenal growth in the number of priests who own automobiles. True, he says, some of them may be necessary. If they are time-savers, and not time-killers, then he heartily approves. But he notices that very many of these priests are in what are popularly known as the poorer parishes of their dioceses, or parishes in which all of the parochial work devolves upon one or two priests. He remarks, also, that a great many young priests, parish assistants, have automobiles, even when their pastors do not own them, and he has repeatedly met with young priests acting as chauffeurs for

their pastors, thus taking both priests away from the parish house at the same time.

Covering so large a stretch of the country, my friend has begun to keep a tabulated list of automobile accidents in which priests have figured, not always heroically, and he has a most interesting file of priests who were arrested for violating the speed or traffic regulations. He tells me further, and with a dry attempt at wit, that no sooner had be become accustomed to meeting priests en tour dressed in what he called "citizen" collars, than he is confronted by those same priests not wearing any collar at all, but with shirt sleeves rolled up, annihilating space, or mastering the intricacies of the latest twin-six model.

He also notes, for his business directs his attention especially to that feature, that in very many parishes whose rectors or assistants own automobiles, the Church building and grounds seem to lack the immaculate neatness and scrupulous care one so much desires about the house of God. He regrets to state, also, an increasing difficulty in making collections from these priests after selling them a bill of goods. He remarks, also, that in very many of such parishes there are no parochial schools. Most of the priests of his acquaintance and observation who own automobiles give as the reason that it enables them to work in their parishes more quickly, and more efficiently. To this we could all say a fervent Amen, although my traveling friend's personal experience is that he is required to call on these priests several times before finding them at home, which leads him to believe that their automobiles are not so much for use in the parish, as to get out of it, for what is called pleasure riding, sometimes, indeed, with the devout female sex, or visiting neighboring parishes at a considerable distance, and outside the diocese. Accustomed to go to Mass on weekday mornings, and to frequent Communion, he is often compelled to forgo this privilege because the pastor is away on a tour in his machine. Furthermore, he finds the conversation of all of these priests occupied almost exclusively with automobile matters, such as makes of machines, tires, maps, roads, etc. He finds, further, a not very consoling fact, that in visiting seminaries, or in meeting seminarians during their vacation, as he goes about his business,

that judging exclusively from their conversation many of them are anxious for their ordination, not so much for the conversion of souls, as for the opportunity the priesthood seems to open up for the purchase of an automobile.

All of which inclines my Catholic traveling friend to the opinion that the automobile may contain a germ fatal to the American clergy. He seems to think it wastes their time, that it takes them out of their parishes too much, that it makes it difficult for them to study, that it has a tendency to excite the envy of the poor in their parishes who cannot afford such a luxury, and what to him is worst of all, it seems to be attracting into the priesthood those who seek the comforts of the sacerdotal state, and not its sacrifices.

Personally, I think he is too hard on us priests. He expects us all to be like St. Paul and St. Philip Neri and St. Francis de Sales. I tell him the times have changed. I really did intend to buy a Pierce Arrow, but since he talked with me, and groaned in spirit over the outlook, I thought I would wait a while until I could ask the Editor of the REVIEW whether I should do so, and perhaps some of my clerical brethren can furnish me with some arguments that will make it easy for my conscience to get at least a "Ford".

REMOVABLE RECTOR.

STANDARDIZATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

At the Convention of the Catholic Educational Association held in Baltimore, the last week of June, a resolution declaring it advisable to draw up a list of standard Catholic Colleges was tabled after a lengthy and unenlightening discussion. The vote on the question of tabling the motion was almost equal. The main reasons, so far as I could observe, for opposing the motion were, first, the fear, on the part of some, that some colleges might fall below the standard, and so lose prestige in the eyes of their patrons, and, second, the fact that there was no authoritative body in existence that could draw up such a list without appearing to discriminate against the weaker colleges, or that possessed sufficient power to add sanction to its decisions.

There may or may not be justice in these contentions. My point is that the matter is too important to allow the discussion to lapse. If we had a monthly educational publication I should want to open the question in its pages at once, and to keep up the agitation during the interval between meetings of the Association.

Meantime, for the good of the cause, I beg leave to lay this suggestion before the readers of the REVIEW. Why not establish at the Catholic University: (1) a standard Catholic secular college; (2) a standard Catholic ecclesiastical college? The University authorities would, in the first place, determine the conditions or requirements of each type of college, and show those requirements in actual operation. In the second place, they would be able, by actual experience, to apply these standard requirements, not rigidly, but with fair uniformity, to other colleges that might seek admission to the list of standard colleges of either type. And, finally, the University authorities could publish from time to time the list of standard colleges, retaining on the list only those that continue to maintain the requirements. PROFESSOR.

The REVIEW does not enter into the merits of the suggestion here made, except to record the opinion that the question is by no means easy of solution. We publish "Professor's" communication because there are some phases of the question which interest the Catholic clergy as a whole, and so long as subscribers or correspondents confine themselves to those phases of the question, they are welcome to a reasonable amount of space in the pages of the REVIEW.

THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS FOR THE VALIDITY OF ORDINATION.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Qu. I should like to have your judgment on the validity of the ordination to the priesthood or presbyteratus in case the bishop uses only one hand at the essential imposition of hands, i. e. when also the priests who assist at the ordination impose their hands upon the ordinandi. *Casus non fictus.* ANTONINUS.

Resp. According to the Roman Pontifical the ordination of priests calls for a threefold imposition of hands. In the

first, the bishop and the assisting priests place hands on the heads of the ordinands in silence. Then they hold their right hands extended over the heads of the ordinands while the bishop pronounces the prayer. Finally, toward the end of the Mass the bishop places both hands on the head of each newly-ordained priest, whilst he says: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remiseris,* etc.

The last-mentioned imposition of hands is not held to be essential to the ordination act, since it is of later introduction in the ceremonial, and in the Greek rite of ordination it is omitted altogether.

The former two acts would seem to fulfil the required sacramental (external) expression by the imposing of one hand by the bishop, since they sufficiently indicate the purpose of ordination.

SUNDAY EXCURSIONS AND SUNDAY MASS.

Qu. A few weeks ago some ten or twelve of my parishioners wanted to go on one of our customary Sunday excursions. As my place is some miles away from the town where the excursion train was to pass very early on Sunday morning, they drove over to that town on Saturday. "If," they said, "Mass happened to be early enough in that town not to miss the train, they would assist at Mass; otherwise, well. . . ."

Now the first Mass in that town on the following Sunday happened to be at 6 A. M. The train was due to leave the station at 6.50 A. M. The distance from the church to the depot is a ten minutes' walk. My parishioners, having a vague desire to comply with the precept of the Church, went to the church in town. Everything went on nicely for a while; but lo on that particular Sunday a pastoral letter was to be read in all the churches of the diocese by order of the Ordinary. It was 6.35 when the priest finished reading the letter. My excursionists grew nervous. Two girls gave up the excursion, but the others—as well as a few hundred of the town people—considered themselves excused from hearing Mass on that Sunday and rushed to the station.

The priests do not seem to agree very well among themselves on that point. Some, who take a generous view of the matter, claim that in our case there was a "ratio excusans". An excursion is the first vacation day that most of these young boys and girls enjoy since two or three years, they say. Other priests do not at all look

at it in the same way. They reason that our good Southern people are unfortunately too fond of worldly amusements and will omit their Mass not only when they go off on a Sunday excursion—once or twice during the season—but a good many times besides, e. g., when they have planned an automobile ride or a drive to some neighboring bathing resort and so on. "The most lukewarm Catholics," they say, "exist in those parishes where the parish priest never or hardly ever finds fault with the actions of his parishioners."

A third class of priests argues that in all the towns where the excursion train is to pass there should be, all during the summer, a low and short Mass—without sermon—not later than 5 or 5.15 A. M. "The pastors of these places can do this in favor of the excursionists just as well as a pastor in the city will have a low and short Mass celebrated at noon, in favor of the stylish people, who find the hour of the early Masses inconvenient and the ceremonies of the high Mass too long."

A reply from a brother priest, or, if you will be kind enough, from yourself, will be deeply appreciated. A. V.

Resp. Leaving aside the disposition of the individual priests, a proper solution of the above difficulty should suggest itself from the following considerations:

1. Our people, especially the young, need, and will seek such recreation as is provided for them by occasional excursions on Sundays.

2. They also and above all else need to conserve their religion, and to avoid deliberate violation of the precepts of God and His Church.

3. It is the part of a thoughtful and benevolent priest to facilitate the attainment of both; that is, the observance of God's law and service, and the having of proper recreation such as offers itself in the form of periodical excursions, especially for the young people who have few other means of recreating, as in the case mentioned (since to most of these young boys and girls it is the only vacation in two or three years).

Why should not then both pastors confer with each other for the welfare of their flocks? If they foresee the excursion and know that a large portion of their people is interested in it, might they not arrange between them to facilitate the attendance of Mass and also the excursion afterwards? If

the priests were to accommodate their hour of Mass, finding some other way to inform the people of the "special announcement" or putting it in brief, or repeating it at another time, or through the other channels, it would probably be no harm to religion. At the same time it would strongly attach the people to their pastors, seeing the solicitude of their priests for their temporal as well as their spiritual welfare. It would do much more for religion than any amount of preaching against the neglect of Mass. In other words it is the "multiplying of bread", but it supposes of course that the shepherd cares for and loves his flock, and that he does not stand on custom and rights, or on the assumption that people will do their duty because they ought to do it, and that they must be driven instead of being attracted to God.

THE KEY OF HEAVEN.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Allow me, as an old missionary, to call attention again to a little book prefaced by the great Lehmkuhl's and the late Cardinal Franzelin's words. The simple truth in a short word is that any adult seeking the grace of God can be saved at death by a true act of perfect contrition and repentance; and also that any infant can and should be baptized, even secretly, at the point of death by any one within reach, capable of doing this act of charity.

It is a sad fact that thousands of babies die, even with Catholics near and around them, without any effort being made to give them this "key of heaven". It is a matter that should be inculcated from the pulpit as well as in the classes of Christian doctrine and catechism. Occasionally one meets with expressions of sentiment such as: "This dying child is not my relative and I have nothing to do for its soul". Such was Cain's reply to God: "Am I my brother's keeper?" which denies the principle of Christian charity.

The writer, with thirty years' experience in the priesthood, is convinced that nearly always at death a little apostolic, zealous effort can save a soul, and make of it a friend waiting for us at the gates of heaven. As the Gospel says: "Facite vobis amicos ad aeterna tabernacula". J. A.

THE RIGHT OF CELEBRATING SOLEMN REQUIEM MASS IN A CHURCH.

Qu. Father John, an assistant priest in a large parish, has by his zeal and piety endeared himself to the members of his flock. Father John is asked by some of the members of his flock to sing Requiem High Masses for the repose of the souls of their deceased relatives. Father John's pastor refuses to allow him to sing the High Masses in the parish church and tries to convince him that the pastor alone has the right to sing Requiem High Masses in the parish church. Father John, rather than cause any trouble to arise between himself and his pastor, returns the stipends to his friends, telling them that his pastor will not permit him to sing a Requiem High Mass in the parish church. Father John is anxious to know what are his rights in regard to accepting stipends for Requiem High Masses from his friends and whether or not his pastor has the right to forbid him the use of the parish church when the members of the parish wish him to sing High Masses for their departed loved ones.

Resp. The pastor of a church is the appointed guardian of all that pertains to the public worship—so far as Catholics are concerned—within his parish. To him belongs the arranging of the services, the solemn Masses and devotions, the hours for the performance of the sacred functions, the public administration of the sacraments and all that concerns the external welfare of his flock. The assistant priest aids the pastor in his work, but, like a lieutenant in the army, whilst having full commission and rights as officer, is under the direction of the superior in every matter, outside the domain of conscience, that appertains to the ministration of the parish. Hence the pastor also arranges the matter of burials or requiem functions, nuptials, memorial services or other public and parochial celebrations, or he entrusts such arrangement to his coadjutor who is always presumed to act as vicar for the pastor.

The emoluments that derive from such functions are usually divided *pro rata* between the pastor and his assistants, the sexton, organist, etc. The method is as a rule regulated by diocesan statute.

Whilst no one can prevent the faithful from attaching themselves by preference to an individual priest who happens to endear himself to them by his zeal and kindly services, the

latter is not at liberty, in virtue of his position, to use the church or parochial appointments for any private or personal service, unless so far as it has the sanction of the pastor. It boots nothing to say that the pastor is peculiar, unreasonable, careless and disliked. It is far more important that authority should be maintained and respected in the Church, as in any other legitimate government, than that the people be pleased with a priest. If hero-worship were the criterion of rights and duties, rights and duties would be soon lost. The army, the civil service, any sound business company recognize this fact, and it is equally important in the external administration of the Church.

If Father John, the assistant priest in a large parish, "who has by his zeal and piety endeared himself to the members of his flock", were to add to these accomplishments that of discrete good sense, mixed with a bit of charity for both his pastor and the people who want him to sing their Requiems, he would have said to these latter: "Certainly, we will arrange to have the Mass, as you desire. However that is a matter which I must confer upon with my pastor. Since it is our Lord who really offers the Holy Sacrifice it matters not who says or sings the Mass, so far as the soul of your relative is concerned".

The people would be more likely to be edified by such unselfish reserve, especially if it were made plain to them that the Church does not regard individual qualities as essential in her sacramental ministry; and that an assistant priest may not use the church to emphasize his own popularity, any more than a captain may command his men to perform military drill for the benefit of his friends without reference to the wishes of his general.

Father John's manner implied an injudicious display of indiscretion which might easily be mistaken for pride. To return the money to those who wished to have the Mass said assumed that their faith was lodged in the pious Father John and not in Him who is offered on the altar of propitiation. Furthermore, it was a reflection on the pastor, at least by endorsement of the sentiment that places personal qualities above the essential and God-given prerogative of priestly ordination.

LOCATION OF CONFESSIONAL.

Qu. A number of priests have held a discussion about this point of Rubrics: Are we allowed, in this country, to have the confessionals in the rear of the church? They are in that place in a number of churches and in some cathedrals that I have seen. Is there any law against it? I would be very grateful to you for an answer in the REVIEW.

Resp. There is no special decree on the matter. The Roman Ritual, Tit. III, Cap. I, n. 8, says: "Habeat (sacerdos) in ecclesia sedem confessionalem in qua sacras confessiones excipiat: quae sedes patenti, conspicuo et apto ecclesiae loco posita, crate perforata inter poenitentem et sacerdotem sit instructa". There seems to be no reason why a place in the rear of the church, behind the last pews, should not be considered open and conspicuous, and in the arrangement which generally prevails in our churches it is not only convenient, but the only convenient place.

CONFESSION AND COMMUNION OF GREEK CATHOLICS.

Qu. In my parish there are many Roman Greeks. As a rule, they seldom attend my church, nor do they send their children to my Sunday school for instruction. There is no Roman Greek church in the town, the nearest Greek priest being six miles distant. He comes only at Easter time for confessions. Occasionally a Greek child comes to catechism, and what I want to know is this: Could I lawfully give them their first Holy Communion under one species if their parents desired it? The only instruction that such children get must come from their parents. Again, in marrying a Roman Greek and a Catholic of the Latin rite can I lawfully hear the confession of the Greek and give them Holy Communion? It seems to me to be the only thing to do, in the circumstances, and I have already done so in one instance.

Resp. In regard to the confession of Ruthenian or Greek Catholics in Canada, a decree of the Propaganda dated 18 August, 1913, says expressly: "Fideles rutheni, etiam in locis in quibus adest presbyter rutheni ritus, apud sacerdotem latinum ab Ordinario loci adprobatum peccata sua confiteri et beneficium sacramentalis absolutionis valide et licite obtinere possunt". We are certain that our correspondent has the

faculties to hear the confessions of Greek Ruthenian or Ruthenian Catholics. Similarly, in regard to Holy Communion. Communion under one species is lawful for any Catholic of Oriental rite. The only requirement is that an Oriental who receives Holy Communion under both species in his own rite should make an effort to perform his Easter duty and receive Viaticum according to that rite.

While this is the law in the matter, it would be advisable that our correspondent, if he can, should persuade the Ruthenian priest to visit his town occasionally, prepare the children of that rite for Holy Communion, and administer the sacrament to them in their own rite. If the Greek priest does not respond to the invitation, the pastor is justified, as we said, in acting, especially as he has the parents' consent. However, it would be proper for him to advise the children that they are to be loyal and devoted to their own rite, and that they should, if convenient, make their Easter duty according to that rite.

THE PRE-NUPTIAL PROMISES.

Qu. A Catholic girl accompanied by a baptized non-Catholic came to me nearly four years ago and asked to be married to him. I obtained a dispensation from the impediment *mixtae religionis*. However, he refused to sign the usual conditions and they were married by the civil magistrate. She, ever since, has wished to have the marriage made valid, and he is willing to renew the marriage consent in the presence of the priest and two witnesses, but positively refuses to sign the *Cautiones*. Furthermore, he states categorically that the children born and to be born shall be baptized and reared in the Lutheran religion. I know that the decree of 21 June, 1912, makes concessions in the case of those who refuse to sign the pre-nuptial agreement, but I am in doubt about this case.

Resp. As in most matrimonial cases submitted to us, our first advice is: Consult your bishop. It is possible—not knowing all the circumstances, we cannot go farther than this—that, although the Ordinary may not be able to allow the mere *passive presence* of the pastor in this case, he may, by recourse to Rome, be able to find a solution. In an exhaustive exposition of the question regarding the obligation of the *Cautiones*, a learned theologian wrote in the REVIEW for October, 1912: "For instance, a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic were

married three or four years ago before a Protestant minister or a civil magistrate, and therefore invalidly. . . . Let us suppose that the unfortunate Catholic consort, realizing his or her condition of concubinage, begins to repent and has recourse to the pastor. The non-Catholic agrees to renew matrimonial consent before the pastor and witnesses, but refuses to make any engagement regarding the Catholic training of the children already born or to be born. The grave circumstances in the case . . . may form a sufficient reason justifying the revalidation of the marriage, even though the *cautiones* be not made." There is, as is evident, a difference between the cases of a *matrimonium contrahendum* and a *matrimonium contractum*, even though the latter be invalid on account of clandestinity.

ANOTHER CASE.

Qu. Could I have your opinion on the following? January, 1909, John, a Catholic, married Bertha, a non-Catholic baptized, before a Protestant minister. John promised her at the time that the girls of this union would be reared in the Episcopal Church, the boys to be brought up Catholics. John is anxious now to make his Easter duty and have his marriage adjusted. Bertha consents to a marriage before a priest, but absolutely refuses to sign the promises, stating that the girls are and will remain Episcopalians. There are two boys and two girls. Could a dispensation be obtained under these circumstances? Must the case go to Rome?

Resp. Again, it is a question of *matrimonium contractum*, although the marriage was invalid, as it took place after 1908. The natural and correct procedure would be, as in the preceding case, to set forth in a petition to the Ordinary the unusual difficulties in the case, the moral impossibility of inducing the parties to separate, the very grave consequences to the children if the parents did separate, and so forth. The bishop may then refer the case to Rome, or to the Apostolic Delegate.

AN UNUSUAL FORM OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In some parts of Spain the Lord's prayer is recited in public according to an unusual form:

V. Our Father, Who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name.
R. Amen.
V. Thy kingdom come.
R. Amen.
V. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.
R. Amen.
V. Give us this day our daily bread.
R. Amen.
V. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us.
R. Amen.
V. And lead us not into temptation.
R. Amen.
V. But deliver us from evil.
R. Amen.

I thought this unusual form might interest some of your readers.

RENEWING THE SACRED SPECIES.

Qu. Kindly inform a subscriber how often one is obliged to renew the Sacred Species in this country under ordinary circumstances.

Resp. The question has been discussed at length in the REVIEW, Vols. XL, p. 762 and XLI, p. 630. The rubric of the Roman Ritual (Tit. IV, Cap. I, n. 7) says: "Sanctissimae Eucharistiae particulas *frequenter* renovabit". *Frequenter* is, of course, a term the meaning of which is determinable by diocesan statute, the opinion of theologians, and the pastor's own judgment based on observation, on the consideration of climatic conditions, on the verdict of chemists, etc. Seven days, fifteen days, twenty days, and in very dry, cold climates even a longer period—these are some of the opinions and decisions mentioned by theologians. It is hardly necessary to add that, while no general rule may be framed, the prudent pastor will be on the safe side and will remember that, according to chemists, changes may have taken place in the species without their being perceptible by the senses.

OBLIGATION OF ATTENDING CONFERENCE.

Qu. In the announcement of the regular semi-annual Conferences held under the presidency of the dean, in the episcopal city, it is stated that the clergy are bound *sub gravi* to attend. A holds that *sub gravi* cannot be taken in its technical sense because the common law of the Church on the question does not so bind, and there is nothing in the decrees of the National Synods that can be so interpreted. For instance, the Third Council of Baltimore says: "Those who absent themselves frequently are to be punished". B, on the other hand, maintains that *sub gravi* is to be taken in the strict theological sense of "binding under the pain of mortal sin", because the law ordering Conferences is itself *gravis,* and the authorities, in this case, are within their rights in interpreting it as binding *sub gravi.*

Resp. The question is one of obedience. As is well known, the promise which a priest, at ordination, makes to his bishop is not a vow, but a solemn and public profession of the reverence and obedience which he owes, *multis ex titulis* to his ecclesiastical superior. The rules laid down by theologians in regard to the obedience which religious, by reason of their vow, owe to their superiors do not, therefore, apply to the relations between a priest and his bishop. Nevertheless, there exists a distinct obligation on the part of the priest to observe the diocesan regulations, and this obligation may be *sub gravi.* If the diocesan authority, owing to peculiar circumstances, interprets the diocesan statutes to forbid *sub gravi* unexcused absence from a Conference, there is, it seems to us, a grave obligation to attend. Of course the superior's ruling in the matter must, *attentis circumstantiis,* be reasonable; otherwise, it does not bind. In the case before us we do not see how the phrase of the announcement, "the clergy are bound *sub gravi* to attend", can have any other meaning. We cannot, however, say, without knowing the circumstances, whether the grave obligation really exists.

THE OBLIGATION OF INSTRUCTING CHILDREN.

Qu. In a gathering of priests recently there arose a discussion concerning the decree of the saintly Pius X on the obligation of instructing children. Father A said that every pastor must give instruction once a week for one hour, except during the hot months, June, July, August. Father B held that every pastor is obliged to

give an hour's instruction every week throughout the year. Father C maintained that a pastor is bound to instruct the children every Sunday and holiday for the space of one hour. Finally Father D thought that the decree would be observed if the pastor gave fifty-two hours' instruction every year.

Resp. The words of the decree in question are definite: "Parochi universi, ac generatim quotquot animarum curam gerunt diebus dominicis ac festis per annum, nullo excepto, per integrum horae spatium pueros ac puellas . . . ex catechismi libello erudiant". The obligation rests immediately and directly on the pastor, unless he be legitimately prevented from discharging it. He may, however, discharge the obligation through the instrumentality of others whom he employs for the task. Moreover, as Lehmkuhl points out (Vol. II, n. 820), the obligation does not hold when the religious instruction of the children is provided *alicubi abundantiori modo*, or when a dispensation has been granted. If, therefore, as Father A implies, it would be seriously inconvenient to hold an hour's instruction every Sunday and feastday during the hot months, permission may be sought from the Ordinary to suspend the weekly instruction during these months.

MASS "SINE MINISTRO".

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In your several responses about a faculty to say Mass "sine ministro" you insist that it requires a "gravis causa" to use the faculty. Lehmkuhl, Vol. II, No. 244, says: "permitti tamen potest ut, *alio ministro deficiente,* femina praesertim sanctimonialis, respondeat e longinquo, atque sacerdos solus sibi in altari omnia subministret, idque sive ea necessitate, sive vi consuetudinis *ex rationabili causa*". Hence, I don't see, according to your interpretation, what practical use there would be for the faculty at all, since, I think, the "consuetudo" is quite general to have a sister respond "e longinquo" where there is no server, and a "rationabilis causa" would be to begin Mass on time or almost any other convenience. Again, if you could get any boy or man to kneel in the sanctuary and carry the book and bring the cruets, would he not be a "minister" sufficient to fulfil the general law?

In your response in the July number, p. 83, to the query about the pastor who demands that the children, before being admitted to First Holy Communion, should know "how to go to confession", you agree with him on that point. But how much does this pastor demand under that condition? If little children must know a certain form by heart, including an act of contrition and perhaps even the Confiteor, and be able to go along fluently without any help, we will have to postpone First Communion for most of them quite beyond the age "in qua puer incipit ratiocinari". If to know "how to go to confession" means that the child must know what confession is, what it must confess, and that it must be sorry for having offended God and resolve to be better, then we must all agree with this pastor. As soon as possible, of course, every child must learn to make a confession fluently and unaided; but I think the quickest and easiest and safest way for the confessor is to dispatch a child's confession by a few prudent questions to get a sufficient accusation and a short fervent exhortation in the form of questions to elicit the contrition and resolution of amendment.

Besides, there are many more things a child must know, necessitate praecepti, and of more importance than "how to go to confession", so that if we begin to postpone children's First Holy Communion on this plea we will soon drift back again to the old practice. We cannot get away from the truth that to receive the loving Saviour into its little innocent heart is beyond all comparison the most important thing for every child; and to expedite that most propitious event is the best thing we can do to please the Sacred Heart.

PASTOR.

INDEPENDENT ODD FELLOWS.

Qu. A man tells me that he belongs to the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and that the Order is different from the Odd Fellows. If he is correct, I presume that membership in the Order would not exclude him from the Sacraments. I would consider it a favor if you would give some definite information on the subject, as, no doubt, others too, would like to have the status of the Independent Odd Fellows determined.

Resp. If the Independent Odd Fellows are a distinct organization they are not, of course, included in the condemna-

tion *nominatim* of the Odd Fellows. However, membership in the Independent Odd Fellows may be forbidden by the more general condemnation of all secret societies that plot (*machinantur*) against Church or State or are deserving of condemnation on account of their aims or practices. Our correspondent should, on the one hand, be slow to accept an unsupported statement that the organization in question is not affiliated with the Order expressly condemned. On the other hand, he should not, even on the most reliable information, take it on himself publicly to condemn a society that is not expressly condemned by the Church, although he may *in tribunali* act on the information.

ROSARY OF THE WAY OF THE CROSS.

Qu. I wish you would give a little information through the pages of your REVIEW which, I am sure, will be of use to others as well as to me. Who, or what religious community or society has the faculties for blessing and indulgencing the Rosary of the Way of the Cross? I find the beads very useful for old and infirm people, and am anxious to know where I can have them blessed and indulgenced.

Resp. The expression "Rosary of the Way of the Cross" seems to be misleading. For the benefit of persons who are feeble or infirm, or who are otherwise unable to go to the church or chapel in order to make the Way of the Cross, the Holy See has granted the privilege by which such persons can gain the indulgences attached to the Way of the Cross by holding in their hands a crucifix specially indulgenced for the purpose, and reciting prescribed prayers. An article in this number of the REVIEW (pp. 259-265) describes in detail these conditions and tells who has the faculties to bless the crucifixes of the Way of the Cross. It is expressly decreed that the crucifix in question may be attached to a rosary. The prescribed prayers are, usually, twenty *Paters, Aves* and *Glorias*, and if, as we learn from our correspondent, beads to represent these are attached to a crucifix indulgenced and blessed for the Way of the Cross, such a rosary might, though incorrectly, be called a Rosary of the Way of the Cross. There is no recognized blessing, so far as we know, for such a rosary, though there is for the crucifix to which the beads are attached.

THE USE OF EASTER WATER.

Qu. Is there any ecclesiastical authority for the following statement which I find in "Advanced Catechism" by the Rev. Thomas J. O'Brien (McBride & Co., 1901), page 246: "Easter water is for the baptismal font, and for blessing the faithful and their homes at Easter time, but should not be used instead of holy water at other times"?

Is it possible that it becomes unblessed after Easter: if so, what about that in the baptismal font? I have met this bit of curious teaching in many directions, but have been unable to trace it to its source. J. H. M.

Resp. The author's phrase "should not be used instead of holy water at other times" can hardly be intended to mean that the Easter water loses its blessing after the lapse of the Easter period. Though the phrase requires correction, so as to avoid ambiguity, it was obviously meant to convey the thought that Easter water should not become a substitute for the holy water, to be blessed at other times, and thus dispense at any time with the latter blessing, since Easter water was intended to be used chiefly as an Easter sacramental.

IS AUSTRALIA AHEAD OF US?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The following statistics may be of interest to your readers:

	United States.	*Australia.*
Catholic Population	16,309,310	897,027
Number of Catholic Schools	6,397	1,284
Number of People to One School	2,549	698
Children in Catholic Schools	1,456,206	134,630
Total Number of Churches	14,961	1,706
Proportion of Churches to Schools	2.3 to 1	1.3 to 1
Number of Priests (Secular and Religious)	18,994	1,125
Proportion of Priests to Catholic Population	1 to 805	1 to 797
Area	3,026,789	2,974,581
Population	91,972,266 (1910)	4,455,005

The above statistics (excluding area and population) are compiled from the Australian Ordo for 1916 and from the Catholic Directory of the United States for 1915. The Australian Ordo for 1916, which contains the directory, was published in December, 1915. SACERDOS.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

CHRISTOLOGICAL THEORIES. 16. THE CHRIST OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

I. A Retrospect. For twenty-five years Union Theological Seminary has been an object of interest to the student of Christology. It came into the limelight first because of the higher criticism of the Bible by Dr. Briggs. He was tried for heresy by the New York Presbytery in 1892; and was acquitted. The General Assembly was then orthodox enough to overrule the finding of the local Presbytery; in 1893, it suspended Dr. Briggs from the Presbyterian ministry. Nothing daunted, the professor went on in his teaching. His fellow professors were so at one with him, that the Directors of Union Theological Seminary voted to cut away from the Presbytery. They turned their school into a "non-sectarian" seminary,—save the mark! Dr. Briggs, finding himself a *non-sectarian minister* of the Gospel, in 1900, took orders in the Episcopal Church, which was then a bit more broad in its Christianity than was the General Assembly of the Presbytery.

For a while it was rumored that Dr. Briggs would become a Catholic. In his theological question for the times, *Whither?* [1] he shows a marked respect for the Catholic Church and a desire of union with that ecclesiastical body corporate. And yet here, as elsewhere, there is an equally marked disrespect for the Papacy. Later on appeared *The Bible, the Church, and the Reason.*[2] The Church was set down as the "great fountain of authority"; moorings were cut loose from the "narrow set of modern Bibliolaters"; companionship with Cardinal Newman was emphatically made out to be preferable to that of hide-bound Protestantism. And yet the revised edition of his *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* [3] showed how very far was Dr. Briggs from either the Catholic Church or the old-fashioned Protestantism he terms

[1] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889, *passim*, especially pp. 184 ff.
[2] Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892, pp. 19 ff.
[3] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.

Bibliolatry. The decision of the Biblical Commission in regard to Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch put an end to all speculations concerning the Romeward tendencies of Dr. Briggs. He was in fact going the way of the Modernistic current; took this Modernistic current as Catholic; was quite satisfied with the Catholicity of Loisy and Von Hügel; and came suddenly upon the cataract of Papal hostility to Modernism. His disappointment is evinced in *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch,*—a letter to Baron Von Hügel, and the baron's milksop reply on the Catholic position.[4] The last will and testament of Dr. Briggs in matters of faith, *The Fundamental Christian Faith,*[5] is a study of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. It is remarkably favorable to the Catholic interpretation of the articles of these creeds; and yet shows the Modernistic earmarks. Thus we are told of

> The incarnate relations in the human life of our Lord as a continuous and personal experience, best explained, as I think, by the doctrine of a gradual incarnation.[6]

And what is this *doctrine of a gradual incarnation?* Is it the gradual evolution of the consciousness of Jesus, or of the conscience of the Church in regard to the Incarnation? Is it the gradual manifestation of the Deity in Jesus by a fuller and a fuller immanence of God in Him? Dr. Briggs does not tell us. We can only surmise. He leaves the nature of the Incarnation to psychological research. "The question of a single or double consciousness", the "distinction of the subconscious state from the conscious state",—all such Modernistic vagaries will have to be hauled into the solution of this essential difficulty of Christological science.[7]

Such a vagueness of faith is no "fundamental Christian faith" whatsoever. Nothing of Christian faith survives, if its very fundamentals are allowed to be matters of doubt. If there had been in Jesus a double consciousness,—a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde transformation,—by which he wittingly or unwittingly shifted from the consciousness of humanity to that of Divinity; then he would have been either an imposter or a

[4] New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1906.
[5] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.
[6] Op. cit., p. 311.
[7] Op. cit., p. 318.

dupe. And as for the explanation of the Divinity of Jesus by an arousing of the subconscious into the conscious, it is mere twaddle. It means that there was, in the subconscious or *subliminal self* of the Christ, a hazy sort of an idea that he was God. Some great nervous upheaval brought this subliminal consciousness to the surface. And, presto, Jesus became conscious of his Divinity. This blasphemous theory supposes, as we have already said, while analyzing Dr. Lake's Christology,[8] that Jesus was an ordinary man, subject to the nervous abnormalities of any so-called psychic person. No one can sincerely hold the Divinity of the Psychic Christ. Psychic persons are mere men, and very abnormal men at that.

While Dr. Briggs was thus sloughing off Bibliolatry for Modernism, the rationalism of Union Theological Seminary went from bad to worse; and there was a steady inflow of its product into the New York Presbytery. For some years past there has been an annual stir in New York because of the admission to licensure of various candidates of Union. And a few years ago, the orthodoxy of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States was put to the test by the heresy-trial of Dr. Francis Brown, President of Union Theological Seminary. The doctor was so fearless of his position, that he went to Europe on a vacation; he came back to find that he had been declared *not guilty*.

II. Status in 1915. At the Spring meeting of the New York Presbytery in 1915, the rationalism of the four candidates that had been admitted to the ministry from Union Theological Seminary so aroused the small minority of six orthodox members, that they issued a protest against the licensure of these budding Modernists. This protest was printed by Dr. Fox in his pamphlet "Does the Presbytery of New York need a Visitation?" From Dr. Fox's survey of the condition of the Presbytery of New York, we cull the data here subjoined.

1. *Ritschlian Presbyterianism.* Four graduates from Union presented themselves. Their theological papers were of the vague Ritschlian sort. Ritschl's substitution of the Jesus-value for the Jesus-fact has already been explained by us.[9] Nothing could be more high-sounding than the veiled degradation

[8] Eccl. Review, March, 1916, "A Harvard Christology", p. 351.

[9] Cf. Eccl. Review, March, 1915, pp. 568 ff.; April, 1915, pp. 488 ff.

of the Divinity of Christ in the jugglery of Ritschlian phraseology. What is ever lauded is "the *ideal* preëxistence of Christ". Only the careful student takes note that this *ideal* preëxistence precludes *actual* preëxistence. Rarely is there a clear visualizing of this degradation of Jesus. All thought of Chalcedon's "Very Man and Very God" is lost in the maze, and the haze, and the daze of words, words, words. They "honor Him as God", but will not say clearly that such He is. They see in Jesus "the force and value of God", but will not affirm that His nature is that of Very God. Only now and then is a Ritschlian so outspoken and clear as is O. Ritschl in his article on *Albrecht Ritschl*: "Although the earthly Christ lacks the traits of divine omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence, he is recognized and honored as God by the faithful".[10] Equally clear is Theodore Haering: "As being the full Revelation of God, Jesus is more than any 'god' of the olden time, but just for that reason He is not 'God'; otherwise He would not be a Revelation of God."[11]

Along these very lines of high-sounding obscurity, the Union Theological candidates for licensure set forth the Atonement as "a sacrifice perpetually carried on in the heart and mind of God Himself". Dr. Payson, one of the Committee on Examination, informed the Presbytery that not one of the four papers showed "he would not say a clear conception, but any distinct conception whatever of what the Atonement was".[12] They believed in the Deity of Christ; but had their own mental reservation as to the meaning thereof. One wrote:

> The Incarnation is, I believe, God's revelation of Himself to man, and I believe that in Christ He has shown us not all that He is, but what He is everywhere and always like. While Christ is the perfect incarnation, I believe that, by the work of the Spirit in the world, each one of His followers became the incarnation in the greatest possible degree according to the will of the Father.[13]

The Incarnation thus becomes, in the minds of these New York Presbyterian ministers, nothing more than the working

[10] Cf. *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, x, p. 46.
[11] *The Christian Faith*, ii, p. 640.
[12] Dr. Fox's pamphlet, p. 5.
[13] Ibid., p. 8.

of the Spirit in the souls of men. We are all a part of the Incarnation; in all of us is the manifestation of the Deity. We all "continue the Atonement". As for the union of two natures, the human and the divine, in Jesus, One Divine Person, that is as foreign to these young men as would be Gros Ventre or Assiniboin.

2. *The Virgin Birth.* Holding so vague notions of the Incarnation and the Atonement, and admitting merely a greater measure of the manifestation of the Deity in Jesus than is to be found in the rest of men, the four candidates from Union Theological Seminary could not have the orthodox idea of the Virgin Birth of the Christ. Not one of them would clearly say that Jesus was born of a Virgin. All were carefully trained to avoid a categoric answer. The examiners could get out of them only the stereotyped formula: *I do not deny, but I cannot affirm.*

The Virgin Birth was, indeed, accepted by one of the four; he was minded to teach this doctrine "as conserving certain truths". And what truths were conserved to the faithful by this fundamental doctrine of Christianity? The Ritschlian, cornered by his examiners, made the foolish reply that the dogma of the Virgin Birth of Jesus conserved the truths of "the perfect humanity of Christ". Could anything be more absurd? Would He not have had a "perfect humanity", if He had had a man for a natural father?

3. *The Resurrection.* Another fundamental doctrine that the Union Theological product would not affirm, was the Resurrection of Jesus. St. Paul clearly taught: "If Christ be not risen, then vain is our preaching, and vain, too, is our faith".[14] The young men disagreed with St. Paul. They were quite willing to accept the "empty tomb"; but were not sure whether the tomb had been emptied by the hand of man or of God. And when pushed to the wall in regard to the miracles of the Bible, the retort was given by one:

> You need not ask me in detail all that part of the Bible. I look at it in the same way. You know perfectly well that I hold the same views as are held by Driver, George Adam Smith, and Dr. Francis Brown.[15]

[14] I Cor. 15: 14.

[15] Dr. Fox's pamphlet, p. 7.

Dr. Brown, President of Union Theological Seminary and of the New York Presbytery, remained ominously silent. Dr. George Adam Smith, the leader of the Presbytery in Edinburgh, and Dr. Brown, the leader of the Presbytery in New York, were committed to the denial of the miracles of the Bible,—even of the physical Resurrection of Christ. Why should the young candidate for the Presbyterian ministry be urged to accept any more than an ideal Resurrection,—the value of the Resurrection-idea to the faithful?

III. Status in 1916. History repeated itself one year later. At the Spring meeting, 1916, of the New York Presbytery, to quote Dr. Fox, a member of that Presbytery:

> Three more candidates from Union Seminary were licensed at the April meeting to preach, and one of them will be immediately ordained without further examination, after they had acknowledged serious doubts,—so serious that they could not preach or teach the Virgin Birth of Christ, the raising of Lazarus, or the resurrection of the body of Christ, the signs and wonders of the Exodus, the pillar of cloud and fire, the Manna, the Tabernacle, the miracles on Mount Sinai.[16]

1. *The minority protest.* After the written and oral examination of the three candidates, whom Union Theological Seminary had presented for licensure, it was found that only three members of the New York Presbytery were opposed to the admission of the young men to the ministry. There were 128 ministers and 33 elders registered for the Spring meeting, —161 in all. Ninety-four did not vote on the licensure. And the vote in favor of the products of Union stood 64 to 3. Last year the orthodox vote was six; this year it has fallen to three!

We quote from the protest of the minority of three,—two ministers and an elder:

> 1°. The candidates, both in written statements and verbally, refused to affirm their faith in the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Repeated

[16] *"Critical Scholarship" versus The Bible.* A further survey of the condition of the Presbytery of New York as shown at its Spring Meeting, 1916, with special reference to its relations with the Union Theological Seminary. By John Fox, D.D., LL.D., a Member of the Presbytery. New York, 19 Cedar Street: E. J. Hall Press, 1916. P. 5.

and prolonged questioning failed to shake them in this position. Mr. Chaffee took the same agnostic position as to the raising of Lazarus and the resurrection of Christ's body. Mr. Douglas declared that the Scripture writers contradicted one another. Messrs. Chaffee and Douglas could not say whether or not they believed in such miraculous narratives of the Old Testament as the Pillar of cloud and fire, the Manna, and the like.

2°. All this made it plain that the candidates did not consider the statements of the Holy Scriptures, even on the most solemn facts of the Gospel, to be sufficiently authoritative to determine their faith, but claimed the right to set them aside in deference to the judgments of "Critical Scholarship".[17]

Such is the published protest of the minority vote of the New York Presbytery. It is past our understanding, unless we be *au courant* of the times, how the majority of the New York Presbytery adhere to the Presbyterian faith. The doctrine of their *Confession of Faith* in regard to the Virgin Birth is clear; it is such as we Catholics adhere to:

> The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin; being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance, so that two whole, perfect and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person without conversion, composition or confusion, which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.[18]

This doctrine can scarcely be that of the sixty-four members of the New York Presbytery who voted to admit to licensure the Union Theological Seminary graduates in question. Nor can the ninety-four silent members of the Presbytery be deemed to have full faith in the Christ of the above-given Chapter viii, section 2 of the Presbyterian *Confession of Faith.*

2. *The tricks of Union graduates.* What has deceived the majority of the New York Presbytery? The high-sounding phrases of the Union Seminary rationalists, and the infiltration of Ritschlianism—the logical consequence of Lutheranism. If faith be not our Catholic act of the reason but the Lutheran trust in Christ, it is easy for the so-called evangelical to be

[17] *Critical Scholarship*, p. 11.

[18] *Critical Scholarship*, p. 18.

deluded by the usual cant of the Ritschlian. "Religion is a life, and not a creed." "What matters is not what Christ was, but what he is to you." "It is the value of Christ in your life that counts." Such cant has gradually taken the place of the old-fashioned creed of the Presbytery. And it is no wonder that young men are admitted to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, so long as they profess to teach the value of Jesus to the Christian conscience. This they make shift to do. Be the historical or dogmatic difficulty what it may, the trick of the Union graduate is ever the same,—to cling for dear life to this life-preserver of Ritschlian faith, the value Christ is to the Christian conscience.

One young man, in his written confession of Presbyterian faith, writes:

> I accept as fundamental to the Christian Gospel those truths which the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is intended to express and conserve; namely, the complete humanity and the complete deity of Christ. . . . That I cannot affirm my belief in the historicity of the Virgin Birth with the same confidence that I affirm my belief in the historicity of the Resurrection, is due solely to the fact that I believe the Biblical evidence for the former is not so strong as for the latter. I cannot, however, too strongly affirm that I both appreciate and sympathize with the experience and truth which the doctrine itself conserves.[19]

Yes, that is all the Union product means: "I both appreciate and sympathize with the *experience and truth which the doctrine itself conserves.*" It is a religious *experience* he *appreciates,* and not an *historic* fact. The Virgin Birth is a *dogmatic truth,* not an *historic* truth. With the *historic* truth of the Virgin Birth of Jesus he does not *sympathize.* For, as Dr. Fox tells us, when pressed hard, he gave up Ritschlian jugglery; and boldly "refused to affirm faith in the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Christ, as recorded in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke".[20]

Another young Ritschlian graduate of Union wrote:

> As I am convinced that God was incarnate in Christ because of what Christ was and is and what he has done and is doing, the exact process by which God did so incarnate Himself has become for me of secondary importance. However he was born, I know that God was in him reconciling the world unto Himself, and I am content.

[19] *Critical Scholarship,* appendix. [20] Ibid., p. 11.

. . . The Birth of Jesus, then, becomes a problem, and on it scholars have different (views), men of profound learning and of the deepest piety holding divergent views. This being the case, I am unable to take any dogmatic stand, leaving the problem to more competent minds.[21]

Note the stereotyped proof of this Ritschlian incarnation,—" what Christ was and is and what he has done and is doing ",—that is to say, the Christ-value to the Christian conscience. " The exact process by which God did so incarnate Himself has become of secondary importance." Because this *incarnation* means merely immanence of the Deity in Christ. Of first importance is the Christ-value; of secondary importance is the Christ-fact. This young higher critic of the New Testament showed his attitude, while under oral examination. He refused to affirm the historicity of the Virgin Birth as narrated in the Gospels; and " took the same agnostic position as to the raising of Lazarus, and the resurrection of Christ's body ".[22]

The third candidate wrote thus of " the so-called Virgin Birth ":

Scholars disagree regarding the subject. In view of all this, I feel that I must keep my mind open. The time has not come for me to reach a conclusive dogmatic position on a matter concerning which I find that Mark, John, Paul, not to speak of Christ Himself, kept silent. Far more important than physiological processes are the life and character and influences of Jesus. However he began to be, Jesus is for me the unique Son of God, my Lord and my Master.[23]

There it is again,—"the life and character and influences of Jesus ", " what Christ was and is and what he has done and is doing ",—that is the Ritschlian proof of the incarnation, of the immanence of the Deity in Jesus. The question whether Jesus had a man for His Father is not faced. That were to occupy one's self with " physiological processes ". And it is *dogmatic,* not *physiological* processes that are of importance to these young men and their preceptors. What is of interest is the process of evolution of the Christian conscience,—its evolution of Jesus the man into Christ the God Man. This evolution is the result of nothing more than a greater immanence of the Deity in Jesus than in any other man, a fuller

[21] *Critical Scholarship*, appendix. [22] Ibid., p. 11. [23] Ibid., appendix.

incarnation of God in the Christ than in any other mediator between God and man.

3. *Blasphemy of this attitude.* Do these young men and the Ritschlian professors of Union Theological Seminary ever think of the blasphemy of their attitude toward Jesus the Christ? If He was not born of a Virgin, if the "power of the Most High"[24] did not effect in the womb of His Blessed Mother the miraculous conception of Jesus, if He had a man for His father, then, who was that man? Such was the doubting state of mind of Joseph. The angel removed his doubt:

> Joseph, son of David, fear not to take to thyself Mary thy wife; for that which is begotten within her, is of the Holy Spirit.[25]

Is the revelation made to Joseph of nothing worth? Does the Bible err in this clear statement of the Virgin Birth? Are we to-day in the same condition of doubt about "physiological processes" as harrassed Joseph? Then the question must be pressed: Who was the father of Jesus? Not Joseph! Then, who? The ministers of the Presbytery of New York, who are the product of Union Theological Seminary, can give no answer that will remove from the mind of a decent man the revolting conclusion that necessarily follows this denial of the Virgin Birth of the Saviour. All that He did, all that He does now, wains before the horrible suggestion, made by these ministers of the Gospel of Christ, that Joseph's doubts were well founded,—that Mary conceived Jesus of man, and that that man was not her spouse.

Such being the degradation of the Christ in Union Theological Seminary, we are not surprised to learn from the daily press that Dr. Lake of Harvard has been loaned to the New York institution. He will there attempt to degrade the Saviour still more. He will dump into the New York Presbytery a batch of ministers who hold, though they dare not preach, that lowest degradation of the Divinity of Jesus which is to-day called "the eschatological Christ". We shall next year see whether the New York Presbytery has vitality enough of old-fashioned faith in Christ to slough off the skin of eschatology which Union Theological Seminary will, under Dr. Lake's benign influence, straightway proceed to grow.

Woodstock, Maryland. WALTER DRUM, S.J.

[24] Luke 1:35. [25] Mt. 1:20.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE SACRAMENTS. Vol. II: The Holy Eucharist. A Dogmatic Treatise by the Right Rev. Mgr. Joseph Pohle, Ph.D., D.D., formerly Professor of Apologetics at the Catholic University of America, now Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the University of Breslau. Authorized English version, based on the fifth German edition, with some abridgments and additional references by Arthur Preuss. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., and London. 1916. Pp. 408.

The English version of Dr. Pohle's great work comprises four volumes devoted to the Sacraments. This is exclusive of the treatise on Grace which introduces the study of Sacramental Theology.

The present volume contains the arguments for the fact of the Real Presence with its Operative Cause—Transubstantiation; further, an exposition of the sources and modes of Eucharistic ministration; and the explanation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in which the Blessed Eucharist is perpetually renewed by consecration of the elements of bread and wine.

Here, as in other sections of Dr. Pohle's work, we are impressed by the lucid method of exposition, especially in what regards the more practical or distinctly apologetic part of the treatise. Every student of theology realizes the difficulties connected with the interpretation of Transubstantiation. Around it are grouped numerous speculative discussions to which the Mystery of the Real Presence has given rise in the schools. What we most look for, however, in modern theological commentaries is the answering of certain homely objections which involve apparent contradictions. Such are chiefly the continued existence of the Eucharistic Species of bread and wine without their natural subject; likewise the mystery of multilocation; that is, the simultaneous existence of Christ in heaven and in many places on earth. Now whilst these questions can be answered only by accepting the facts as a supernatural act or miracle, just as we accept the fact of creation out of nothing, the apologist derives distinct satisfaction from having the statement of the difficulties brought out clearly and without minimizing their natural force. Not infrequently theologians are tempted to speculate upon the process of the miraculous action by adducing reasons and arguments either from analogy or by assuming certain conditions of matter and form which are purely subjective or tentative. This gives to their mode of defence a character of speciousness or disingenuousness. Dr. Pohle, while taking account of accepted scholastic distinctions, does not lay

on them any more stress than they merit, and leaves intact the supernatural cause as the chief explanation of the mystery. Even here we wish he or his translator could have avoided the Latin terminology which refers to the school methods and rarely give much light to the lay reader for whose benefit translations are after all chiefly intended. Like the formulae of algebra, these terms are meant to serve the student in argument and to save the multiplying of explanations; but the lay reader needs more. Bishop Hedley has given us a good example in this particular topic of how we may avoid technicalities which appeal to the theologian in schools only, and which are irritating to the lay reader who may want to make the subject clear to himself or to those outside the Church for whom the dogma presents real difficulties. It is quite sufficient for the average intelligence in search of truth to know that it is a fact demonstrable from Scripture and historical tradition. To believe it demands an act of faith in the power of God. That is an acceptable position, and we need not show how a divine act is produced, so long as we can demonstrate that there is no contradiction in the act and that it is only seemingly contrary to reason. "He who comes to the service of God must believe that He exists." Given the meaning of God as an omnipotent and all-loving Father, we need only seek for proof of the fact that He has spoken or acted and declared His will in our regard.

The third part of the tract is on the Mass. Particularly satisfying here, too, is the lucid treatment of difficulties. The author reviews in turn all the various theories regarding the metaphysical essence of the Mass, or rather whether and in what degree the scientific concept of sacrifice is realized in the consecration of the bread and wine. All theologians agree by their definitions in recognizing the requisite elements of the sacrificial gift and the sacrificing minister in the Mass. The problem that calls for solution lies in the determination of the real sacrificial act, or more specifically in the transformation of the sacrificial gift, since the glorified Victim, being impassible, cannot be really transformed, much less destroyed, as would be required in order to make a true sacrifice.

The author reviews in turn the different theories on this subject. In each case he adds a critical appreciation. While rejecting as unsatisfactory the teachings of Vasquez, Suarez, Cardinal Cienfuegos, of the Salamanca school, and Thalhofer, he favors as acceptable the theories of Cardinal Billot, followed by Gihr and Atzberger, of the Jesuit Lessius, and of Cardinal De Lugo. These latter hold, with minor distinctions as to manner, that there exists in the sacrifice of the Mass a true destruction of the offering. They differ in their mode of explaining the precise element or moment of this destruction or separation. Suarez, whom Arriaga, Casalius and Scheeben

have followed, does not put the sacrificial action proper in the double consecration, but secondarily in the destruction of the elements of bread and wine, and primarily in the substantial reproduction of the true Body and Blood of Christ. Here, too, we must return to the chief fact as demonstrable, namely that there is a real sacrifice, though it passes through various forms more or less in harmony with what may be considered the principal elements of the sacrificial act.

Dr. Preuss has in this, as in his other volumes, added greatly to the usefulness of the original by his references to recent literature in the vernacular. Thus the student is enabled to reach out to the practical interpretation of Catholic Dogma for educated converts and others who desire to make a more thorough study of the teachings of the Church of Christ.

Three further volumes—dealing with the subjects of Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony, and Catholic Eschatology—will complete the work. Two of these are already in press, and the third is in preparation, so that we may look for an early possession of this dogmatic reference library of twelve volumes.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONALITY. A Phase of the Philosophy of Education. By Brother John Chrysostom, F.S.C. With an Introduction by Thomas W. Churchill, LL.D., Former President of Board of Education, New York City. John Jos. McVey, Philadelphia. 1916. Pp. 400.

Out from the convent walls within which in retirement and prayer the Brothers of the Christian Schools prepare themselves for their arduous but sublime work of education, there breaks forth from time to time a light of more than ordinary brilliancy—a light which for the passing hour at least arrests the world's attention. Unintermittingly indeed does the light of the spirit pour forth from these homes of prayer and study. Caught up by the souls of youth upon whom it falls, it is reflected and re-reflected until in its gentle unobtrusiveness it bathes the lives of uncounted thousands. But this is light suffused to which as to the all-embracing light of day men grow accustomed and quite unheeding enjoy its beneficence:

> With earth's warm patch of sunshine
> Well content.

Aside from this disregarded illumination, however, there breaks out occasionally from these religious hearths a light of singular power which for a time challenges notice, so that men turn to observe its nature and in its radiance to consider the object field upon which it falls. That gentle and singularly humble Brother, Azar-

ias, was one such light to the generation now passing away. Catholics in this country are not yet alive to the debt they owe to this faithful and learned teacher. A truly Christian Brother, he belonged likewise to the wider brotherhood of letters. In him were combined gifts of acute discernment, profound insight, genuine erudition, and graceful expression—qualities not usually conjoined within the same subject. Brother Azarias was at once a philosopher, a historian and a man of letters. A profound thinker, he was at home in the principles of things. A tireless searcher amidst the sources of history, no one had a finer sense of justice and loyalty to truth. With his delicate feeling for form he touched nothing which he did not adorn. Had Azarias not been of the unhonored Nazarenes he would have ranked high in the world's republic of letters. Had he been a professor in a secular university he would have taken the place justly due him amongst the acknowledged leaders of thought. Even as it was his light could not be confined to the walls of his convent or school or even of the household of faith. The lectures he delivered before secular conventions and the papers he contributed to educational literature show that he exerted an influence in the outside world of thought.

The foregoing allusion to Brother Azarias is here made because his example suggests that of another member of the same Christian Brotherhood whose intellectual activity having been long spent in a field that lies in the valleys and the meadows rather than along the upper slopes, its fruits have not been so conspicuous in the eyes of even his Catholic brethren. It may well be that to many who read these pages Brother Chrysostom will not be known as a writer; though doubtless some of the clergy will remember him as a successful teacher in Manhattan College. Brother Chrysostom's activity has consisted chiefly in translating and adapting religious and spiritual books out of the French into English—an unobtrusive occupation, though in some respects more arduous and often demanding more knowledge, skill, and tact than does original production. How difficult, indeed, such work is becomes apparent when one recalls the many monuments of foreign masters that have been disfigured by translators. The three goodly volumes of *The Exposition of Christian Doctrine*—dogma, moral, worship—and *The Manual of Christian Doctrine*—a compendium of the larger work—as also the series of graded catechisms accompanying these books; not to omit *The Catechist's Manual*—this collection forms a complete and systematic exposé of Christian doctrine. That the clergy, religious teachers and their pupils possess this valuable apparatus of Christian instruction is due to the skill and industry of Brother Chrysostom, though the title page of none of the volumes mentions his

name. For the rest not a few other manuals of devotion as well as text-books on literature and philosophy owe their existence to his untiring pen.

Other works of similar nature he has at present on the stocks—awaiting the finishing strokes preparatory to their launching. Perhaps it may not be out of place to say here that Brother Chrysostom's published work has been done between whiles—in times snatched from the labors of the class hall, which is the habitual habitat and workshop of the disciples of the saintly La Salle.

Pass we now from these generalities regarding the author to his latest work. Here we have to do with a production which is entirely original. It is a unique and a valuable contribution both to the philosophy of education and to the science though not to the art of pedagogy. It deals with the development of personality—in the first place the personality of the teacher and therefore indirectly and by necessary implication, with the personality of the taught, the pupil. It embodies a phase of the philosophy of education, that is, it brings into light and relief the rational principles of education as they condition and effectuate the development of personality. Now, surveying the educational field as we find it, we are confronted with two general methods or systems of education, methods which obviously rest on a theory of life as well as of education—the secular and the religious. The former is pursued by the normal school—an organ of the State's educational system. The latter is at home in the religious novitiate—a branch of the educational system organized in the Catholic Church and under its direction. Now suppose we take two young men. Let them be as far as possible equally equipped naturally—that is physically, intellectually, and with what we may call healthy moral tendencies. Place these two, one in the normal school and the other in the novitiate, say of the Christian Brotherhood. Give each of them equally capable instructors, educational equipment, environment, and so on. The only difference shall be that the student in the public normal school is not a Catholic and consequently accepts neither the truths of faith taught by the Church nor her sacramental ministries, much less the discipline of conventual life, such as meditation, examination of conscience, communal religious life. None of these agencies enter into the formation of his personality. On the other hand, the novice in the Christian Brotherhood, let him have equal natural opportunities but supplement them with his specifically religious endowment of faith, reception of the sacraments, meditation, brotherly association. Which of these two youths is liable to be best equipped for his vocation or profession of teaching? The answer to this question will of course depend upon the respondent's attitude toward the educational value of supernatural

faith and religious discipline. The secular may regard these factors as obstacles or as at best of little or no efficiency. On the other hand, the advocate of the novitiate will appraise them as agencies of distinctive educational value. But the answer should be no offhand decision based either on prejudice or inadequate information on either hand. It should be based on careful accurate analysis of the educational factors involved in each of the two systems.

It is scientific investigation of this kind that we find in the volume before us. Here is no apriori declaration that the religious system must in the very nature of things be more efficacious. Brother Chrysostom, having examined very carefully, even in places minutely, the natural educational processes, passes to a close study of the pedagogical influences of faith where it exists in the mind of an intelligent teacher. The broader horizon which the truths of faith present to the teacher, together with the intrinsic power of the habit of faith energizing in the mind, the feelings, the will, the whole soul of the educator; the mental discipline resulting from meditation and examination of conscience; the educative power of community life, and its sociological influence—all these agencies are critically examined and objectively estimated. Broadly viewed, the discussion covers three fields: the biological, the psychological and the sociological. In the first of these domains, the three educational factors, heredity, environment, and plasticity are considered. The influence of heredity is fully recognized.

It were indeed desirable that the education of a child could begin two hundred years before its birth. Nor is there any reason why one should draw the line there. It were still more to be wished that the process could be started with the primitive family, the head of the race. The Catholic system recognizes the natural deficiencies entailed by the primal sin—defects inherited by every child of the first Adam, but for which the Second Adam has instituted a remedy. There is such an agency as elevating and medicinal grace and the Catholic educator recognizes it as an auxiliary both in his own development and in that of his pupils. This of course has no place in the secular system. Based as the latter usually is upon the hypothesis that man has evolved from a material and bestial ancestry, there is no elevating and medicinal potency granted the soul by the Author of nature and of grace. All educational forces spring either from the environment—wherein the supernatural has no part—or from the material organism. So, too, with the elements of environment and plasticity. These within the Catholic system are seen to have a certain distinctively formative influence which is lacking in the secular system. The same is shown to be the case as regards the

psychological value of faith, its teachings, its sacramental instruments and the spiritual discipline it entails.

Lastly, a special educational advantage, from a sociological point of view, is seen to result from the community life of the novitiate. In the novitiate the religious teacher is aided by prayer, meditation and sacraments to conform himself to his social environment in such wise as to perfect himself in the social virtues, in other words to develop his personality by fostering the communal spirit. Each religious is for all and all are for each. We cannot here enter into the arguments whereby Brother Chrysostom establishes his thesis. We must refer the reader to the book itself. There he will find a wealth of thought and suggestion such as he will get from no other book of its class. The author has sifted the bulk of educational literature. From it all he has derived many a support for his contentions, while not a little he shows to be both pedagogically and philosophically unsound and inadmissible. He has therefore demonstrated to Catholic teachers not only the strength of their position—that perhaps was not essential nor did he specifically intend it—but he has pointed out in a fuller and more definite manner the bases, the rational grounds upon which their platform rests. He has done this, moreover, in an up-to-date method. He uses the language of the educational world. He has seized its concepts and its nomenclature and he has utilized them to explain and to set before the world of to-day the rational superiority of religious education. It is not improbable that some readers, especially those who are not familiar with the terminology of recent psychology and pedagogy, will require a little effort to accustom themselves to the more technical terminology. They have not been used to think of religious concepts in terms of modern science. The biological and sociological, if not the psychological, aspects of faith, the pedagogical value of meditation, the utilization of the reflex arc concept in the formation of habits, and so on. These are not the familiar traditional categories. However, they are all made plain and clear in the context, while they keep the discussion *en rapport* with the current forms of educational thought. Moreover, should the reader unused to these technicalities regard them as expressive of "mere analogies", let him not forget that all forms of language by which our sense-laden intelligence strives to express its thoughts concerning the things of the mind and the spirit must of necessity be "analogous". We have no other terms at command. We have no intuitions of things spiritual. We can only speak of them in a figure, even as we see them but in a glass darkly. The only question there can be is how to select the analogies most fitting and most suggestive. In this Brother Chrysostom has happily succeeded. He not only em-

ploys the terms and figures common to the science with which he deals, but the very terminology consecrated by sacred usage.

The language of the Bible relating to the soul's activity is almost invariably biological. Man must be *born* again; his soul is to *grow* unto likeness to the *Life* who came that he might have more abundant life. And so on. The well-known author of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* has constructed quite "a spiritual biology" which while some may think fanciful is certainly suggestive, and, eliminating its unfortunate pelagianisms, serviceable. Brother Chrysostom has done something similar though much more scholarly, critical and sound in the department of education. He has given Catholic educators a solid work—one which they can profitably use for their own instruction and feel safe in placing in the hands of their non-Catholic brethren. F. P. S.

CONSUETUDINES IN FUNOTIONIBUS LITURGICIS seu Collectio Quaestionum quae proponi possunt pro Solutione a singulis Calendaristis, auctore Petro M. de Amicis, P.C.M., Directore "Ephemeridum Liturgicarum". Romae: apud Officinam Ephem. Lit. 1916. Pp. 158.

The decorum and beauty of divine worship depend so closely upon the exact performance of the rites and ceremonies that every true priest must of course be solicitous about the minutest rubrical prescriptions. Take for instance the matter of the inclinations at the altar. How edifying it is—or would be—to see exact uniformity in this respect. The bowing of one's head or one's body more or less, the extension of the hands thus or so, these acts are plainly in themselves trifles. Nevertheless in public worship they may take on an importance which an intelligent man, such as an *alter Christus* undoubtedly is, will not ignore much less despise.

Fortunately the faithful while assisting at the Holy Sacrifice are not critical. The sublime act engrosses them and the movements of the celebrant seem to affect them but little. On the other hand, how much more befitting it would be if the severe uniformity of the Roman liturgy were perfectly in evidence. The observant worshiper who has some knowledge of the rubrics must at least wonder when he sees Father Anthony double himself in twain as he groans or shouts in stentorian tones the triple *Sanctus,* while the beholder notes that Father Cyril simply bows the head and barely whispers the sacred trisagion. No doubt many people are edified when they see Father Seraphim stretch wide his arms *per modum crucis* after the consecration; and if the good father were really in ecstacy the rubrical innovation would be pardonable. But alas for straightfor-

ward Father George! He humbly obeys the rubrics, and never thinks of the fact that people remark how much more piously does Father Seraphim say Mass than he!

As a help toward securing uniformity the present volume will do good service. There are forty cases in all. They cover a wide range of subjects each of which is thoroughly discussed. A typical instance might be cited, that namely which regards the use of the linen card or the metal plate at the distribution of Holy Communion. The editor condemns very strongly the plate and argues no less strongly for the linen card. The purpose of the card, he contends, is simply to receive the sacred particle or any notable portion thereof should it perchance drop from the priest's fingers or the tongue of the communicant. Its purpose is not to provide for the minute and almost invisible fragments that may happen to fall. These are to be disregarded and the provision of a metal disc is contrary to immemorial usage, is superfluous and an occasion for scruples. Many priests, however, who are careful but not scrupulous do not use the plate, but the card which they carry back with them to the altar; and they frequently, if not usually find upon the card fragments, that are small indeed though quite discernible as fragments of the sacred particle. There may be at the same time bits of other white substances on the card which may or may not be distinguishable as such. The editor says nothing about the precaution taken by such priests, since he declares that the card is to be replaced (he mentions no inspection) upon the credence table or allowed to remain upon the communion railing.

There are many other vexed questions discussed and solved by the experienced editor. The book is neatly made and well indexed.

THE MEMORY OF OUR DEAD. By Herbert Thurston, S.J. Burns and Oates, London; B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. 1916. Pp. 246.

Like all Father Thurston's books on subjects of the liturgy, this volume presents not merely comments on established doctrines or practices in the Church, but critical research, and in some cases entirely new points of view. It purports to be a comprehensive sketch of the Catholic practice of prayer for the Dead, from the first centuries down to the close of the Middle Ages.

Starting from the Jewish custom of offering alms and prayer for the departed, the author traces the devotional services in the catacomb worship. The Agapé, from being a feast of thanksgiving and a funeral love-feast in connexion with the reception of the Eucharist, gradually became an institution of charity, a dole for the relief of the poor; incidentally it attests the usage of prayer and offerings

for the dead. The Memento for the Departed Souls, in the liturgical offices, begot the order of the Dyptichs; and thence developed the celebration of private Masses, and the use of mortuary rolls or cards. These latter, like the Agapé, became in time a source of abuse. Father Thurston traces the term "rigmarole" to some misapplication by persons who carried the rolls about with them for exploitation. The chapter on "All Souls and its three Masses" is full of novel interest. The same may be said of the chapter on "The Month's Mind". Throughout the author adverts to numerous misconceptions and fabulous traditions on the subject of devotion to the souls in Purgatory. He also contrasts the older views of spiritual writers who love to picture the physical tortures of Purgatory, with the views of later writers like Cardinal Newman in his *Dream of Gerontius*. Whilst the author is careful to point out the exaggerations of tradition in this field, and sharply criticizes the distorting views of men like Frazer, who would have us believe, for example, that the term "feeding the hungry souls" refers to a custom of offering millet porridge for the comfort of those detained in Purgatory, he does not hesitate to stigmatize present-day abuses. Thus "wakes" are instanced as a fungus growth in Catholic communities which had their origin in the laudable usages of earlier days.

PARADOXICAL PAIN. By Robert Maxwell Harbin, A.B., M.D., F.A.C.S., author of "Health and Happiness", etc. Sherman, French & Co., Boston, Mass. 1916. Pp. xxiii-212.

There are probably not very many people—would there were more!—who with Rabbi Ben Ezra can

> welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough
> Each sting, that bids nor sit nor stand, but go!
> Be our joys three parts pain!
> Strive, and hold cheap the strain;
> Learn, nor account the pang; dare, never grudge the throe.

Here indeed is "a sublime philosophy", as Richelieu called it "the patriarch's ladder, reaching heaven and bright with beckoning angels; but alas! like the patriarch we see it but in dreams, dull slumb'ring on the earth", and therefore do we fail to appreciate even though we recognize the

> paradox
> Which comforts while it mocks,

that "life shall succeed in that it seems to fail". On the other hand, whosoever makes us look more steadily at the paradox and

thus enables us to see the realness of the good concealed by the apparent evil but whose face at first seems to us so repellent—he who can do this to any truly effective degree becomes in so far our benefactor. There is, of course, only one really effectual solace for pain, and that is presented to us by religion which at the same time alone answers the problem of its primal origin. Nevertheless human reason investigating the proximate causes and the effects of pain can, especially when it catches up the light of revelation suffused throughout civilized society, do not a little towards relieving some of the shadows wherein the dark problem is hidden. There should therefore be a warm welcome for the volume before us—the more so indeed, that the work, since it comes from the hand of a skilled physician who must needs be familiar with pain in all its forms and degrees, bears upon its face the mark of actuality and experience.

The author distinguishes two classes of pain. First there is "paradoxical pain that sooner or later serves some beneficent purpose and is constructive in its effect". Secondly, there is the opposite kind which, he says, "is evil and works for harm and is destructive". He treats solely of the former kind. By it he understands "all that is uncomfortable" but "works for good and may be classed as physical, mental and spiritual". There is therefore something positive about pain. It is not simply an abnormality, a defect, a privation; nor is it "merely an incident in the beneficent order of things, but a profound cause from which the greatest blessings flow". Viewing it thus, the author takes up in turn the various species of pain and considers each individually in its nature and effects. The book contains a large amount of thought that is illuminating and suggestive. Side by side with the physician the priest is more or less continually dealing with pain in one or another of its myriad forms. While the remedies which he has to administer are chiefly spiritual and supernatural he will in no wise disregard whatsoever light physical science and philosophical reflection can furnish. And so from these pages he can derive no little help. The author, we presume, is not a Catholic, but there is comparatively little in the book to indicate this. He writes reverently and with a Christian spirit. Certain incidental expressions let one surmise how much he owes to a self-sacrificing mother whose example no doubt contributed not a little towards directing his point of view and enabling him to discern

> what lies concealed below
> Our burden and our pain;
> How just our anguish brings
> Nearer those longed for things
> We seek for now in vain.

While there are not a few statements in the book which the reviewer would express otherwise, on the whole he finds so much to praise and applaud that he right gladly and warmly recommends the volume to his readers.

A STUDY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF BERGSON. By Gustavus Watts Cunningham, A.M., Ph.D. Longsman, Green and Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 224.

BERGSON AND RELIGION. By Lucius Hopkins Miller. Henry Holt and Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 295.

By reason of his unique position the intellectual horizon of the theologian should, in some manner, embrace all fields of human knowledge. Every problem that agitates his time will sooner or later come to him requiring that he assume toward it a definite attitude and furnish a sincere, unequivocal answer. Naturally, this presupposes in the priest a mental alertness, a breadth of vision and a wide intellectual sympathy as we do not expect them in other professions. Thus, it becomes imperative for him to follow closely the currents of human thought and to remain abreast of the latest developments of philosophical speculation. No stir in the philosophical world, no ripple on the onward flowing stream of philosophical thought, no eddies that impede its steady progress should escape his notice. Little excuse, then, does he need for delving into the mysteries of Bergson's philosophy; for on this system the attention of thinking men is, at present, focussed.

The first of the two books mentioned above gives a fair idea of Bergson's elusive system, though it is meant primarily to be a critique and not a summary. Let it be said at once that in its critical and analytical parts the book is exceptionally strong. With a rare keenness and an invincible, relentless logic the author bares the inconsistencies and fatal weaknesses of Bergson's method. This is the more remarkable as on many issues he finds himself in accord with the brilliant French philosopher. A dialectical duel affords an exquisite pleasure that cannot easily be matched by anything else; the more so, when the weapons, magnificently tempered and of razor's edge, possess the elasticity of damascene steel and are handled by consummate masters of their art. To such a feast the book invites us. Of Bergson's trenchant dialectic powers there can be no doubt; but in Dr. Cunningham he meets no unworthy opponent. Hence there is nothing dull in this book. It sparkles with bright flashes of quick thrust and rapid repartee; it scintillates with glittering glimpses of subtle evasion and of cutting, telling argument.

Much has been said in praise of the novelty and independence of Bergson's system, and, incidentally, by way of contrast, much abuse has been heaped on the barren traditional philosophy of the Schoolmen. Now, though originality taken by itself constitutes no particular merit, it is well to reduce the extravagant claims made in behalf of Bergson to their true value. Like every other philosophy, the system of creative evolution has its roots in the past and feeds on reminiscences from dead and living thinkers. With good reason Dr. Cunningham writes: "Without Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Galileo, Kant, Darwin, Spencer, and a host of other previous professors, the Bergson who created the philosophy of change could not have been. These thinkers of the past exert in his work a determining influence apart from which Bergsonism as it is at present defined would have been impossible" (p. 13). As we follow the careful analysis of Bergson's thought we realize that his indebtedness to other systems is, indeed, very considerable, and that his vaunted originality, except for the terms in which he conveys his ideas, dwindles away.

The fundamental error that vitiates Bergson's method is his anti-intellectualism, which makes him accept intuition as the organ of philosophical thought. This attitude immediately involves him in a hopeless contradiction; for, though he repudiates intellect, he must make use of intellectual terms in order to state and prove his system. He finds himslf in the same impasse from which Kant found no escape. "If one looks closely at the various passages in which Bergson sets forth his epistemological views, one soon discovers a certain inconsistency of statement which is extremely bewildering. He seems to be constantly vacillating between two radically different views of the intellect and its relation to intuition, without any apparent recognition of the fact that he entertains more than one doctrine. One of these views leads him to depreciate the ontological value of intelligence, and to draw a sharp and absolute distinction between intelligence and intuition, between science and philosophy; while the other view impels him to concede some sort of ultimate significance to scientific knowledge and to assign to intelligence a function within the holy of holies of intuition itself. The first view he constantly and explicitly emphasizes; the second, he seemingly unconsciously and implicitly holds" (p. 32). Yet this second view, tacitly ignored by Bergson, is the more important, since it saves him from utter, sterile subjectivism. But the moment Bergson thus reintroduces by the back door the intellect which he has ejected with so much ceremonious display by the front door, the originality of his system is gone.

If we probe the reasons for this confusion more deeply, what the author, however, neglects to do, we observe that it arises from a mechanical conception of the idea or an unwarranted identification of the idea and the idea-image or phantasm. Bergson, as many of his contemporaries, has never fully grasped the nature of abstraction. Hence his contempt for the concept and his abortive efforts to obtain a glimpse of reality by other than conceptual means.

In consciousness Bergson seeks to reach the heart of reality. What he finds there is flux and change and a certain onward urge. By a bold stroke of generalization he makes this change the ultimate essence of the world. But here again Bergson is wrong; his intuition has been badly focussed; the real nature of his inner self has eluded his grasp. "It is that the analysis of conscious experience which Bergson gives in support of his hypothesis is not an exhaustive analysis; it omits from consideration important features of conscious life, which, when taken into account, force us to the conclusion that our minds are markedly, yes, radically, different from the description which Bergson gives" (p. 110). The great fact which Bergson has overlooked and which completely shatters his arbitrary interpretation of reality, is the permanence of personal identity. At the core of all the changes, we come across something which remains identical with itself through the onward flow of duration and the successive parts of time.

Thus far we may follow the author; but now our ways part. The Creative Finalism which he opposes to Bergson's Creative Evolution cannot satisfy us. It also lacks the rallying point about which the phenomenal may be grouped. The continuity of the world can neither be explained by memory nor by what the author pleases to call creative imagination. Growth, change, duration, and time, are meaningless unless there be something which is to gain by these processes and through them expands and ripens into the fullness of being and perfection. However much one may disagree from the author, his study will prove very thought-provoking and a source of genuine pleasure.

Mr. Miller has undertaken an herculean task and one which, from our standpoint, is foredoomed to failure. For, according to our notions concerning these matters, Bergsonism and religion are absolutely incompatible. And this for the simple reason that the underlying tendency of Bergson's philosophy is in the direction of Pantheism, and that we see no way of reconciling the duties of and practices of religion with a pantheistic conception of the Divinity. But this fundamental difference of attitude will not prevent us from following attentively the interesting deductions of the author

and his logical tours-de-force in trying to distil from the philosophy of change its religious implications. The author is fully aware of the difficulties that surround his task nor does he wish to impose his views dogmatically upon anybody. But it is his opinion that some might be strengthened in their religious convictions by the philosophy of Creative Evolution, and to these chiefly does he address his message. Throughout he shows the greatest reverence for the sacred truths of religion, though to our mind he seems to whittle them away so that there is nothing left of them. Of course this is owing to the fact that the Catholic concepts of religious truth are well defined, clean cut, crystallized and of perfect rigidity, whereas those of Protestantism are vague, plastic and elastic.

In a way Bergson has rendered a service to religion by clearing the ground of a number of materialistic and agnostic theories that obstructed the path of the honest seeker of truth. "It is enough for us here that we remind ourselves of Bergson's fundamental insistence upon the reality of the soul, upon the fact of at least a partial freedom, and upon the essentially psychic, or spiritual, nature of the whole process of evolution. At several points in the elaboration of his system he comes into direct conflict with materialistic theories. . . . There is religious value, as we have seen, in all these protests, looked at merely as protests. . . . Their main service is to level the ground for the positive Bergsonian structure" (p. 57). But we must be careful not to overrate this negative service; for a philosophy must be gauged by its positive contribution to truth, not by its negations.

How Bergson's theory of knowledge paves the way for religion we fail to see; faith is based on a recognition of the validity of reason, which Bergson's epistemology deliberately undermines. It is impossible to gain a firm foothold on Bergsonian principles from which we might reach out to the higher truth of religion.

Religion requires a personal God, an absolute, infinite Being, omnipotent, all holy, and all wise. Bergson's God, if we may at all use the word in this connexion, possesses none of these attributes. By this one circumstance the religious value of his system is settled. The author himself admits Bergson's pantheistic leanings, but, apparently, they do not disconcert him. "This is Bergson's idea of the ultimate reality of the universe, and it is to this idea that we must adjust our conception of God if we are to be both religious and Bergsonian" (p. 105). "In my judgment, Bergson is more open to the charge of being a monistic pantheist than to that of being a pluralist" (p. 108). The following admissions of the author may be judged by their face value. "Certainly incarnation must be conceived of by a Bergsonian as qualitative and not quantitative.

His position is clearly incompatible with a belief in the complete, quantitative incarnation of the Absolute in a single historical being. But there is a far more serious difficulty. The consistent Bergsonian must ever keep open the possibility of future incarnations which would surpass those already given" (p. 114). It is, indeed, a strange kind of Christianity that would be willing to adjust itself to such theories. We meet similar repugnances when we compare Bergson's doctrines on freedom and immortality to those of Christianity. Between Bergsonism and Christianity there is a gulf that no effort at interpretation can bridge over. If the benevolent interpretation of the author can make Bergson's philosophy yield so little of religious implication, it is certain that measured by the more exacting standards of Catholic faith it will be found wanting. Much instruction, however, may be derived from the author's sympathetic plea, which gives evidence of great erudition and fine scholarship.

C. B.

SOCIOLOGY. By John M. Gillette, Ph.D. A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, Illinois. 1916. Pp. 164.

Unfortunately, from the outset sociology has received a false orientation, from which it has not yet succeeded in emancipating itself. Its inspiration is overwhelmingly, if not altogether materialistic and deterministic. The present little volume is no exception to the rule. It parades its materialism with a naive assurance, the more reprehensible because it is destined for a class of readers that are not in a condition to challenge the author's bold statements and to contest the value of his evidence. The truth of evolution is taken for granted and the descent of man accepted as a matter of course. "It is sufficient to remind ourselves that man is the descendant of a long series of ancestral animal forms having their beginning with the unicellular organism. His more immediate ancestor was not the ape or the monkey, but a member of a stock of which these forms were variants. What our remote ancestor was like we now begin to comprehend from a study of recent archeological remains, such as the Javanese Man, the Heidelberg Man, the Neanderthal Man and the Sussex Man. The gap between Man and his animal ancestors is being filled in by such missing links, and the idea of physical continuity is hardly any longer a theory" (p. 14). The existing paleontological evidence does not warrant such an inference. Genuine science is more cautious in its assertions. Summing up the present state of our knowledge on this subject, Branco says with admirable candor and scientific moderation: "Paleontology tells us nothing on the subject—it knows no ancestors of man."

The same uncritical overconfidence crops out again when the author fixes the age of man at approximately one-half million to one million years. The grounds on which these high figures are based are exceedingly slender, and a little more modesty would become the author well. The same thread of materialism runs through the whole work. There is never an appeal to ethical factors; but everything is explained as a play of natural forces and as the outcome of gradual evolution. If it were not for this gratuitous materialism, which is so plainly written across the pages and so effectually mars the neat little volume, it would be a great help for those to be initiated in the science of sociology. For in many other respects the make-up of the book deserves credit; it is concise in statement, reliable in its empirical conclusions and contains many useful suggestions for practical social reform. What the author has to say concerning the equalization of opportunity we could embody with very little change in a program of Christian social reform. The same sober common-sense characterizes the concluding chapter on the elimination of the unfit, in which a high moral tone prevails. Contact with the real facts of life prevents bad principles from working out their logical conclusions; and thus, we have in this instance again the interesting phenomenon of a book, which in its abstract principles we must condemn, but the practical deductions of which we need not hesitate to embrace. If read with due caution, the volume will prove quite serviceable to the student of sociology.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS. A Study of Present-Day Social Conditions. By Ezra Thayer Towne, Ph.D., Professor of Economics and Political Science in Carleton College. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1916. Pp. xvii-406.

In the presence of the very large literature on social problems already occupying the field one may well hesitate before claiming attention for any fresh addition thereto. Nevertheless the subjects with which books of the class deal are not mathematically determined either as to their nature or as to their solution. Social problems are in a measure growing things subject to laws of progress and regress and consequently calling for frequent readjustments to changing conditions both on the side of their objective elements and of our subjective knowledge. Hence the literature that deals with them will be always more or less in flux—at least as regards its surface aspects if not its nether waters.

The book at hand is one of the newest comers into the province and bears on its face certain credentials of obvious merit. The first of these is that of method. In this respect it ranks very high. Each

chapter is preceded by a schematic outline which is so perfectly constructed and presented that the eye takes in the contents at a glance. Moreover, every chapter ends with a questionary wherein the text is again analyzed and the vital details so set as to challenge the scrutiny of the pupil. This feature is followed by an abundant bibliography. The book is therefore a model class manual admirably arranged to answer the purpose both of lecture, instruction and recitation. As regards the ground covered, this is quite comprehensive, as will be apparent from the following list of topics: population, immigration, child labor, women in industry, sweating system, labor organization, unemployment, the blind and the deaf, the feeble-minded and insane, crime and punishment, marriage and divorce, the liquor problem, poverty, conservation of natural resources, conservation of plant and animal life, conservation of human life. The list is evidently sufficiently complete and elastic to comprise at least the most insistent general problems of modern society. As regards the solutions proposed, these, it need hardly be said, are not meant to be exhaustive nor final. They are, however, on the whole characterized by great good sense; they are sane and sound; they are practical and practicable—not aerial nor yet subterranean. A Catholic writer would, it need hardly be said, have insisted on moral and religious factors as essential for an adequate solution of most of the problems discussed. The book is well worth the attention both of social workers and of college teachers, pupils and private students. The volume is neatly made and its price very reasonable.

Literary Chat.

No language can be strong enough to express the shame and confusion which loyal Catholics must feel at seeing their religion dragged into the present European war. That brethren of the same household of faith should be arrayed in deadly conflict against one another is sad enough; but such conditions are the inevitable consequences of national differences. That Catholics, however, should do their utmost to injure one another by religious recrimination is a matter for tears. When one follows the literature pouring from the Catholic press, especially in France and England, and observes the unmistakable spirit of hatred animating it one can but blush with indignation or with shame. The ancient pagans expressed their wonderment at the sight of the early Christian brotherliness, "See how these Christians love one another!" "See how these Christians hate one another!" would seem to be the proper expression at sight of the international feeling manifested by the French and English press.

It has been all along, we need not say, the policy of the REVIEW to hold a strictly neutral position respecting the warring nations. The character of the literature sent for notice has invariably been described with impartial justice. For the most part that literature has emanated from the Catholic press in

France. Recently, however, we have received a paper-bound volume of some 450 pages bearing the title *German Culture, Catholicism and the Great War: A Defence against the Book "La Guerre Allemande et le Catholicisme"*. The latter book bears as its subtitle, in the original, "ouvrage publié sous la direction de Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, Recteur de l'Institut Catholique de France et sous le haut Patronage de Comité Catholique de Propagande Française à l'Étranger". The French book was issued from the press of Bloud et Cie, 1915, and has appeared in an English translation entitled *The German War and Catholicism.*

People who are asking questions regarding the ethics of war are for the most part unaware that they are proposing riddles which were answered four centuries ago by the great Spanish moralist Franciscus de Victoria, O.P. His *Tractate de Jure Belli* is still the classic treatise on the ethics of war. A dissertation submitted by Mr. Herbert Wright to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University as a requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, contains a sketch of Victoria's life and writings and a critical examination of the *De Jure Belli.* It is a scholarly production and will prove useful as an introduction to the text, a new edition we infer is being prepared by Dr. Wright. (Washington, D. C.)

The "Defence" is published by Doctor Pfeilschifter, Professor of Theology at the University of Freiburg (i. Br.) in collaboration with a corps of eminent scholars in Germany. It covers a very wide field of subjects and quite apart from its apologetic aspect is a most interesting and instructive publication. The authorized American edition is issued by the Wanderer Press, St. Paul, Minnesota.

In the flood of prohibition tracts constantly flowing from the press it is gratifying to come across so sane a presentation of the subject as that contained in Father Homan's pamphlet *Prohibition the Enemy of Temperance.* The book was published in 1909; but the "latest edition" is dated 1916. The Bible, physiology, law, economics, are marshalled to show that the strictly moderate use of alcoholic liquors is not injurious and may be beneficial. Prohibition is not a remedy capable of solving the liquor problem. The sane and practicable measure is restrictive license. There is a large amount of sound reasoning, based upon facts and principles, summed up and systematically presented within the compass of 116 pages. The pamphlet deserves a wide circulation amongst all classes of people, whatever their religious profession. It will help to correct some of the excessive and insane notions which unfortunately have gotten a hold upon men who in other matters are perfectly safe and sound. (The author, Box 137, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

We have had repeatedly the pleasure of recommending Fr. Hickey's *Summula Philosophiae Scholasticae* and we renew the feeling in mentioning that the Logic and Ontology now appears in a fourth edition *recognita et adaucta* while the Theodicy and Ethics have reached each its third edition. The fact is sufficiently significative of the sterling value of a work whose merits have been rehearsed time and again in these pages. (Gill & Co., Dublin; Herder, St. Louis; Benziger, New York.)

Sister Mary of Mercy Keruel was a young religious of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, who was born in 1880 and died in 1910 in the convent of her Order, at Angers, France. Owing to ill health her religious life extended over only a few years; but in them she brought to fruition the virtues she had formed in her girlhood. Richly endowed in character and grace, she filled up by intensity of fervor the measure of a long life. Her *Memoirs* have been rendered into English by M. A. M. from the French *Life* published at Angers, 1913. It is an edifying story of a noble, though withal a human soul. The book should find its way into the hands of our young Catholic maidens. Its

perusal could hardly fail to foster the spirit of genuine piety and self-sacrifice. The translation is worthily done. (Sands & Co., London; B. Herder, St. Louis.)

Thinking people will see nothing out of the way, even though it be an unfrequent experience, to find so much consideration as was given, in the August review of books, to a recent work on Chinese philosophy. Priests, especially those whose interest in souls is not bounded by parochial or even national limits, are not oblivious to the Renaissance now going on in the Orient—not only in the nervously energetic people of Japan but in the hitherto seemingly phlegmatic masses of China. What is to be the real nature and extent of the new birth in the East no one will venture to prophesy. Nevertheless the Orient seems to be in travail and the issue is likely to have a profound significance for the Occident. At all events broadly-thinking men are watching with interest if not with eagerness or solicitude the march of events.

But while China is awakening, as we are told along every line of material advancement, the new health does not conceal the disease and corruption, the dense darkness, pervading the vast masses of the people. A very striking presentation of the popular mentality was given to the world a few years ago by a learned scholar for a long time a resident missionary in China. The work is entitled *Recherches sur les Superstitions en Chine,* by P. Henri Doré, S.J. The first part of this remarkable study bearing the title *Les Prâtiques Superstitieuses* appeared in 1911 and was subsequently sent to this REVIEW. Partly through an oversight but partly owing to the fact that the portion received is but a section of a larger whole in course of preparation, the book has thus far escaped attention.

The portion in question comprises a large collection of plates and inscriptions all done with minutest pains and relative nicety of color if not of shape, in Chinese characters. These illustrations reproduce the originals gathered with infinite pains from various parts of China. Each plate is accompanied by a full explanation in the French language.

The matter covered by the illustrations relates to superstitions concerning birth and infancy, marriage, death and burial, life after death, talismans and amulets of many sorts and purposes. The whole is a mass of most interesting even though saddening phenomena.

It is obvious to say that the portrayal of a people's superstitions is a most delicate and even dangerous undertaking. Moreover, perhaps an almost equally dismal exhibition of superstition might be gathered from the popular customs of the enlightened West. On the other hand, it will not be forgotten that P. Doré is fully alive to all this; that he knew what he was doing when he set out upon such researches and had an amply justifying reason for going to the trouble and expense which these investigations have entailed. (Chang-Hai, Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique.)

The Tariff Problem in China may make an even less intense appeal to most of our readers than will Yang-Ming's philosophy. Nevertheless it is worth while noting that the able study on that subject which has recently appeared in the Columbia University *Studies* is the work of a Chinese student who carries with him to China academic honors from an American seat of learning. And if we recollect the number of kindred and no less able monographs that have lately received distinction within the same series of *Studies* the part that American scholars are taking to bring into the lime light the hitherto relatively obscure political and economic wisdom and experience of the Chinese is not without its significance. (Longmans, Green & Co., New York.)

Perhaps it is not so generally known as it ought to be that there are over a thousand Chinese students attending the universities of the United States and Europe. An even larger number go to Japan and Japanese teachers in China itself are counted by the thousands. All this feverish quest for knowledge might be an encouraging sign did we not have the object-lesson of the effect of a similar craving for science which seized upon Japan some four decades ago. The thousands of Japanese students who flocked to Western universities brought back with them rationalism and irreligion whence have sprung frightful immorality and revolutionary and anarchistic ideas—a state of things that is giving the government much concern and confirming the oft-proven thesis that religion is essential to morality and to the very foundations of society.

Amongst the many splendid publications issued by the Society of the Divine Word, Techny, Illinois, there is none that is calculated to do more toward the spread of knowledge concerning conditions in the mission fields of the world than the little pamphlet entitled *The Hour of God in the Foreign Missions.* It comprises a number of articles which were translated from the Spanish of Father Hilarion Gill, S.J.—one of the best informed authorities in Spain on the subject treated—and appeared in *The Queen's Work.* The pamphlet contains only thirty pages but in that brief compass is condensed a vast amount of luminously and interestingly expressed information covering the outstanding features of the fields afar.

Buddhism, Brahmanism, Mohametanism, Rationalism, Protestantism—the present status of these religious organizations; what they are accomplishing and how and where—these vitally interesting subjects are succinctly discussed. Finally the prospects, the hopes and the needs of Catholicism are presented. The little pamphlet should be spread broadcast that clergy and people may come to realize that now indeed, as Father Gill insists, is the Hour of God for the foreign missions. The struggle between Paganism, Rationalism, Protestantism, and Catholicism is keener and more widespread than ever. Surely in a combat so decisive the burden of the fight ought not to be left to one or two Catholic countries whilst all the Protestant countries are working so vigorously and Rationalism and Paganism are making unheard-of efforts. The conclusion is obvious enough. Will it materialize? *Sperabimus.*

The Techny Press is not limiting its good work to the spread of mission literature. Its managers realize that music is an ally of print for the spread of humanizing and elevating influences. Hence it has issued some *Fireside Melodies,* a Collection of Beautiful Songs for Home and School. The music and the words are such as appeal to the heart—not primarily to the head as classical music is meant to do, much less to the feet, as do the vulgar ragtime jingles which unhappily have succeeded in gaining the ear and vitiating the taste of so many amongst our young people.

The series before us is designated as Volume III. It contains twenty-five pieces, amongst which are some American favorites as well as folk songs of various nations—English, German, Irish, Scotch. The arrangements are relatively simple and easy.

A More Excellent Way, a novel by Felicia Curtis, recalls in many respects, the masterful touch, high moral aims and peculiar choice of themes of the late lamented Monsignor Benson. It deals with a conversion and a vocation, topics which never fail to interest a Catholic reader, if they are handled with psychological insight and literary skill, both of which the author commands in no slight degree. The motives that lead to the conversion and that finally blossom into a religious vocation are worked out with that subtler knowledge of the human heart that comes from feminine intuition. The characters are not logical abstractions that move like reasoning automatons through the pages, but real beings of flesh and blood drawn from life as it surges about

everyone of us. Rich colors borrowed from the sea and the mountains form the background for the delicate character delineations and the gripping soul struggles. The plot, though not new, holds the attention and interest of the reader to the happy consummation. The wooing of the lovable uncle is told with infinite tact and a sly humor. The introduction of a family ghost we are inclined to regard as a severe and unnecessary strain on the imagination of the reader. Others may look upon it as a particularly happy stroke. (B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.)

Good models for occasional sermons are not very frequent, and yet the necessity may arise for every minister of the Gospel to hold forth on some unfamiliar occasion. In such circumstances Dr. Keane's, O.P., collection of discourses may prove a source of ready inspiration and a time-saving help. (*Sermons Preached on Various Occasions.* B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.) Many of the subjects therein discussed have the ring of actuality, and any day may again bring them to the fore. Father Keane is a direct and forceful preacher, one who can move the will and touch the spring of tears. He speaks his message with the ardor and courage of the prophet, and it would be well for our times to heed his earnest words.

There is no need to expatiate on the oratorical excellence of Monsignor Besson's well-known discourses. It is enough to say that the publishers are bringing out a new edition of his admirable conferences which, when first delivered, charmed and roused thousands. We have before us the great Bishop's conferences on the God-Man, which have reached the thirteenth edition. (*L'Homme-Dieu.* P. Tequi, Paris.) Dogmatic sermons become more necessary as the spirit of unbelief is spreading. There is an urgent call for them at present. Monsignor Besson's exposition is clear and to the point and his arguments are lucid and impressive.

Those of a more methodical mind may have sometimes longed when reading the *Imitation of Christ,* for greater logical sequence and a closer coherence of its aphoristic sentences so loosely strung together; for even St. Francis de Sales has called this delightful booklet a charming labyrinth of piety. Father Dumas, S.M., meets the wishes of these rigid dialecticians by publishing an edition of the *Imitation* in which we find appropriate headings, comprehensive summaries, and elucidating commentaries. (*L'Imitation de Jesus Christ. Introduction à l'Union intime avec Dieu.* P. Tequi, Paris.) This analysis is a clew that will guide us through the labyrinthine treasures of this wonderful storehouse of piety; it will contribute toward a deeper understanding of its mysticism and unlock its spiritual wealth.

The Merit of Martyrdom, a sermon by the Right Rev. Monsignor O'Riordan (Desclée et Cie, Rome, Italy), unfolds before our eyes a glowing picture of Ireland's sufferings and glories. The history of the nations presents no more thrilling and majestic spectacle than Ireland with its crown of thorns and its unbroken faith. A quiver of emotion runs through every line of this magnificent eulogy, which pays a well-deserved tribute to a people whose loyalty to the Church has not been shaken by centuries of persecution.

The Armenians may also be called a crucified nation for untold woe has come over them. They are a victim of this dreadful war which has brought such a full measure of misery to the peoples of the earth. *L'Arménie Martyr,* by the Abbe E. Griselle (Bloud et Gay, Paris), treats, in a sympathetic spirit, of the sufferings of this unfortunate nation.

The natural expression of genuine religious emotion is verse. If the rhythm and the rhyme meet the exactitudes of metrical art all the better. If they halt slightly here or there, the sentiment, if true, will atone for the fault. This may be said of a wee booklet entitled *My Beloved to Me,* Thoughts and Prayers

in Verse by S. M. A. The verses, as Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J., tells us in his neat little preface, are the expression of the earnest and tender devotion of a cloistered nun in a convent whose chief work is the Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. This will suffice to commend the booklet to the devout reader and his religious friends who like to pray at times as they sing, in number and cadences. (B. Herder, St. Louis.)

One of the last things that came from the tireless pen of the late Monsignor Benson was a brief preface in which he introduced a charming little volume entitled *God's Golden Gifts,* by Flora Lucy Freeman. Ingeniously, as was his wont, he points out that while it is intellectually or metaphysically—that is in the very abstract—true that the present has no reality, is just a point—a "line without breadth across which the future transforms itself into the past"—actually, physically, concretely the present is the *only* reality. And so the little volume embodies "a simple and deliberate attempt to draw attention to the treasures of the present"—an effort urged on by the power of love and gratitude, to catalogue the gifts of God that are ours "to dispose of according to His will or our own, or best of all, according to His will and our will welded together"; gifts that have come out of the past and will go to form the future; gifts of sight, hearing, memory, reading, friendship and other such that belong to nature—or if you will natural grace; and gifts of a higher order—the ministry of angels and Mary, and the Cross, the Presence, the Bread, the Life unending. Each of these gifts is taken up in turn and made to tell in graceful form, frequently in verse, the story of its beneficence. It is a bright little book well calculated to cause unheeding people to stop and think and "count their blessings"; and to be grateful and generous and so to make themselves and their fellow mortals better and happier and hopefuller for the best things to come. A book of gifts it wears a style and shape that make of itself the fittest of gifts. (Kenedy & Sons, New York.)

During the past two months many school teachers—religious and otherwise—have been busy forecasting plans and methods for the year of work opening with the present month. The feverish demand for scholastic progress has converted the vacation period into one of intense activity. The teachers who teach during the working months instead of giving themselves to play during the summer days, as do their pupils—or even to general or special or cultural reading, as do not their pupils—devote themselves to strenuous work, convert themselves into pupils and place themselves at the feet of other teachers to have themselves taught. To none of them may it be said: "Thou that teachest another teachest not thyself". They teach themselves actively and passively—teach and are taught. No doubt all this is wise. Any how it seems to be inevitable.

Among the things teachers of grammar schools have been reading and if not yet heeding are going to put into practice in the near future is the paper written by Father John A. Dillon, Superintendent of Parish Schools in the Diocese of Newark, and published in a neat little brochure under the title *Technical Grammar, its Place in the Elementayr School Curriculum and its Terminology.* The paper was read at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the Catholic Educational Association. The pamphlet contains besides this paper the Report of the Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature and Classification, and embodies a wealth of practical information and suggestion. Those who are watching the results of recent pedagogical innovations note the passing of certain elementary disciplines. Grammar especially seems to be taking a place amongst the vanishing arts or to be becoming absorbed in "language lessons". While it is true that grammar used to be taught much too mechanically and apparently for the sake of its own technicalities, and too far aloof from living speech, the danger seems to lie of late in running to the other extreme, i. e., of laying aside the mechanism of grammar entirely. Speaking with experience and study, Father Dillon makes a strong plea for a safe middle

course. Let the *art* be taught first in the primary grades and let it be followed by a well-defined science. (John Joseph McVey, Philadelphia.)

Probably many of the clergy have seen ere this the pamphlet issued by the America Press entitled *A Campaign of Calumny,* The New York Charities Investigation. Those under whose notice it may not have fallen as yet, and who desire to have in permanent form a reliable account of the whole affair which has created so much sensation in New York City—and indeed throughout the country at large—will find a full and fairly thorough account in this brochure of sixty-eight pages. The illustrations, photographs taken before there was any thought of the official investigation, tell quite a different story regarding the condition of things in the institutions in question from that with which the latter were charged. Aside from its summary of the charges and the evidences pro and con the pamphlet is a fine example of acute argumentation. It might furnish illustrative material for a class of logic somewhat more practical than the familiar

> Nullus asinus est lapis
> Atqui omnis asinus est substantia
> Ergo aliqua substantia non est lapis.

A pellucid illustration of form! Infinitely less instructive, however, it need not be said, than the arguments constructed by the author of this pamphlet—a man who would be equally at home, we fancy, in the chair of Dialectics or in the post of a cross-examining attorney.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

GOD'S GOLDEN GIFTS. By Flora Lucy Freeman. With a Preface by the late Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1916. Pp. xiii-240. Price, $0.75 *net.*

CHRISTUS IN SEINER PRAE-EXISTENZ UND KENOSE, NACH PHIL. 2:5-8. I. Theil: Historische Untersuchung. Von Heinrich Schumacher, Dozent der Neu-testamentlichen Exegese, Catholic University of America. (*Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici.*) Verlag des Paepstl. Bibel Institutes, Rom.

MY BELOVED TO ME. Thoughts and Prayers in Verse. By S. M. A. B. Herder, St. Louis; Sands & Co., London. 1916. Pp. 32. Price, $0.30.

SERMONS PREACHED ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS. By the Very Rev. Dr. Keane, O.P. B. Herder, St. Louis; Sands & Co., London. 1916. Pp. vii-353.

PANIS ANGELORUM. A Memento of My First Communion. St. Bede's Press, London; B. Herder, St. Louis. Price, $0.45.

CONSUETUDINES IN FUNCTIONIBUS LITURGICIS seu Collectio Quaestionum quae proponi possunt pro Solutione a Singulis Calendaristis. Petrus M. de Amicis, P.C.M., Director *Ephemeridum Liturgicarum.* Directio et Administratio *Ephemeridum Liturgicarum,* Romae. 1916. Pp. 159. Pretium, 2 Lib. 00.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONALITY. A Phase of the Philosophy of Education. By Brother John Chrysostom, F.S.C. With an Introduction by Thomas W. Churchill, LL.D., Former President of Board of Education, New York City. John Jos. McVey, Philadelphia. 1916. Pp. 400. Price, $1.25 *net.*

A STUDY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF BERGSON. By Gustavus Watts Cunningham, A.M., Ph.D., George Nye and Anne Walker Boardman Professor of Philosophy, Middlebury College. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London. 1916. Pp. xii-212. Price, $1.25 *net.*

BERGSON AND RELIGION. By Lucius Hopkins Miller, Assistant Professor of Biblical Instruction in Princeton University. Henry Holt & Co., New York. 1916. Pp. xi-286. Price, $1.50 *net.*

SOCIAL PROBLEMS. A Study of Present-Day Social Conditions. By Ezra Thayer Towne, Ph.D., Professor of Economics and Political Science, Carleton College. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1916. Pp. xviii-406. Price, $1.00 *net.*

PARADOXICAL PAIN. By Robert Maxwell Harbin, A.B., M.D., F.A.C.S., author of *Health and Happiness,* etc. Sherman, French & Co., Boston. 1916. Pp. xxiv-212. Price, $1.25 *net.*

SOCIOLOGY. By John M. Gillette, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology in the University of North Dakota, author of *Vocational Education, Constructive Rural Sociology* and *The Family and Society.* (*The National Social Science Series.*) A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago. 1916. Pp. ix-159. Price, $0.50 *net.*

MOHAMMEDAN THEORIES OF FINANCE. With an Introduction to Mohammedan Law and a Bibliography. By Nicolas P. Aghnides, B.L., Ph.D. (Vol. LXX, No. 166. *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 540. Price, $4.00.

SUMMULA PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE in Usum Adolescentium a J. S. Hickey, O.Cist., Concinnata. Vol. I: Logica et Ontologia. Editio quarta, recognita et adaucta. Pp. xii-451. Pretio, 4/6 *net.* Vol. III (Pars Prior): Theodicaea. Editio tertia, recognita et adaucta. Pp. iv-235. Pretio, 2/- *net.* (Pars Altera): Ethica. Editio tertia, recognita et adaucta. Pp. vi-295. Pretio, 3/- *net.* M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin; Benziger Bros., New York; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1916.

PROHIBITION—THE ENEMY OF TEMPERANCE. An Exposition of the Liquor Problem in the Light of Scripture, Physiology, Legislation and Political Economy. Defending the Strictly Moderate Drinker and Advocating the License System as a Restrictive Measure. By the Rev. J. A. Homan, M.A., S.T.B., Associate Editor of *The Inter-Mountain Catholic,* P. O. Box 137, Salt Lake City, Utah. Christian Liberty Bureau, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1916. Pp. 116. Price, $0.50.

L'ÉVEIL DE L'AME FRANÇAISE DEVANT L'APPEL AUX ARMES. Guerre de 1914-1915. Par Messrs. les Abbés Georges Ardant, Jean Desgranges, Thellier de Poncheville. Publications du Comité Catholique de Propagande Française a l'Etranger. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1915. Pp. x-224. Prix, 2 *fr.*

LES CATHOLIQUES AU SERVICE DE LA FRANCE. I. Les Diocèses de l'Intérieur, Paris, Versailles, Meaux. Par Paul Delay. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1916. Pp. 344. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50.

LA SYRIE À LA FRANCE. Par Paul Dudon. Deuxième édition. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1916. Pp. 64. Prix, 0 *fr.* 50; 0 *fr.* 55 *franco.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

O'LOGHLIN OF CLARE. By Rosa Mulholland (Lady Gilbert), author of *Father Tim,* etc. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1916. Pp. 259. Price, $1.25 *net.*

A MORE EXCELLENT WAY. By Felicia Curtis, author of *In the Lean Years, Under the Rose,* etc. B. Herder, St. Louis; Sands & Co., London. 1916. Pp. 300. Price, $1.60.

FIRESIDE MELODIES. A Collection of Beautiful Songs for Home and School. Vol. III. Mission Press, Techny, Ill. 1916. Pp. 32. Price, $0.15.